arXiv:1412.4657v1 [quant-ph] 15 Dec 2014

University of Warsaw

Doctoral thesis

Applications of differential geometry and representation theory to description of quantum correlations

Author:
MSc Michał Oszmaniec

Supervisor:
Prof. Dr hab. Marek Kuś

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Physical Sciences in Physics

in the

Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw

Prepared in The Center for Theoretical Physics of Polish Academy of Sciences



Warsaw, 2014

I dedicate this thesis to my Father

Acknowledgments

I would like express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Marek Kuś and co-supervisor Adam Sawicki. This work would not be possible without their constant support, encouragement and advice.

Marek Kuś - for introducing me into the exiting field of quantum information, for the trust put when three year ago he, despite my little experience in this topic, accepted me to his group at the Center for Theoretical Physics, and above all, for his contagious sense of humor and the positive way of thinking.

Adam Sawicki - for many inspiring discussions concerning connections between quantum theory, differential geometry and representation theory.

Part of this thesis is based on the work I did during my stay at the Institute for Photonic Sciences in Barcelona in spring 2014. I am grateful to my host Maciek Lewentein for his warm hospitality and interest in my work. A special thanks go to Remik Augusiak, a member of Maciek's group, for many hours of educating and inspiring discussions. I also thank Janek Gutt and Szymon Charzyński, my colleagues from the Center for Theoretical Physics.

I would like to thank the reviewers, Paweł Horodecki and Rafał Demkowicz-Dobrzański, for pointing out numerous typos and misprints present in the original version of the thesis.

I acknowledge the support of the NCN Grant No. DEC-2013/09/N/ST1/02772.

I am grateful to my family for their constant support during my Ph.D. studies.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my girlfriend Ola for her kindness, support and patience during the preparation of this thesis.

Abstract

One of the most important questions in quantum information theory is the so-called separability problem. It involves characterizing the set of separable (or, equivalently entangled) states among mixed states of a multipartite quantum system. In this thesis we study the generalization of this problem to types of quantum correlations that are defined in a manner analogous to entanglement. We start with the subset of set of all pure states of a given quantum system and call states belonging to the convex hull of this subset "non-correlated" states. Consequently, the states laying outside the convex hull are referred to as "correlated".

In this work we focus on cases when there exist a symmetry group acting on the relevant Hilbert space that preserves the class of "non-correlated" pure states. The presence of symmetries allows to obtain a unified treatment of many types of seemingly unrelated types of correlations. The symmetries also give the possibility to use the powerful methods of differential geometry and representation theory to study various properties of so-defined correlations: What is more, there exist many physically-interesting classes of correlations that posses continuous symmetries. In this work we apply our general results to particular types of correlations: (i) entanglement of distinguishable particles, (ii) particle entanglement of bosons, (iii) "entanglement" of fermions, (iv) non-convex-Gaussian correlations in fermionic systems, (v) genuine multiparty entanglement, and finally (vi) refined notions of bipartite entanglement based on the concept of the Schmidt number.

The thesis is organized as follows. We first present the necessary physical and mathematical background in Chapters 1 and 2. In Chapters 3-6, which form the core of the thesis, we investigate the natural problems and questions concerning the types of correlations defined above. In Chapter 3 we provide exact polynomial criteria for characterization of various types of correlations for pure quantum states. The Chapter 4 deals with cases in which it is possible to use the criteria from Chapter 3 to give a complete analytical characterization of correlated mixed quantum states. In Chapter 5 we derive a variety of polynomial criteria for detection of correlations in mixed states. In Chapter 6 we use the criteria derived in the previous chapter and the technique of measure concentration to study typical properties of correlations on sets of isospectral density matrices. The thesis concludes in Chapter 7 where we summarize the main contributions of the thesis and state the open problems related to results presented in the thesis.

Streszczenie

Jednym z najważniejszych problemów w teorii informacji kwantowej jest opisanie zbioru stanów splątanych (bądź równoważnie - separowalnych) złożonego układu kwantowego. Splątanie kwantowe nie jest jednak jedynym typem korelacji, który pojawia się w mechanice kwantowej. Tematem przewodnim niniejszej rozprawy jest opis ogólniejszych typów korelacji, które mogą być zdefiniowane w sposób analogiczny do splątania. Od stany matematycznej problem jest następujący. Z pośród wszystkich stanów czystych danego układu kwantowego wybieramy pewien podzbiór stanów, zwanych stanami nieskolerowanymi. Konkretna postać stanów nieskolerowanych zależy od danego problemu fizycznego. Mając dany stan mieszany pytamy się, czy można go zapisać jako kombinację wypukłą nieskolerowanych stanów czystych. Jeśli jest to możliwe, taki stan nazywamy nieskorelowanym. W przeciwnym wypadku określamy go jako skorelowany.

W tej pracy będziemy rozpatrywać przypadki, w których na przestrzeni Hilberta rozważanego układu fizycznego działa ciągła grupa symetrii zachowująca zbiór nieskolerowanych stanów czystych. Obecność symetrii pozwala traktować w ujednolicony sposób różne typy korelacji. Co więcej, pozwala ona na stosowanie zmetod geometrii różniczkowej oraz teorii reprezentacji grup i algebr Liego do opisu różnych własności zbioru stanów skolerowanych. W niniejszej rozprawie zastosujemy te ogólne metody do badania następujących typów korelacji: (i) splątanie cząstek rozróżnialnych, (ii) splątanie cząstkowe bozonów, (iii) „splątanie" fermionów, (iv) nie Gaussowskie korelacjei w układach fermionowych, (v) właściwe splątanie kwantowe (genuine multiparty entanglement), (vi) uogólnienie splątania dwucząstkowego bazujące na pojęciu rzędu Schmidta.

Praca podzielona została na osiem rozdziałów. Pierwsze dwa stanowią wstęp i wprowadzone są w nich pojęcia fizyczne i matematyczne, które używane są w dalszej cześć rozprawy. W następnych czterech rozdziałach, stanowiących główną część rozprawy rozpatrujemy naturale zagadnienia pojawiające się w kontekście próby opisu zbioru stanów skorelowanych. W Rozdziale 3 wyprowadzamy wielomianową charakteryzację szerokiej klasy nieskorelowanych stanów czystych. Rozdział 4 jest poświęcony opisowi sytuacji, w których wielomianowa charakteryzacja stanów czystych nieskorelowanych pozwala na pełny analityczny opis mieszanych stanów nieskorelowanych. W Rozdziale 5 wyprowadzamy, korzystając z wyników Rozdziału 3, rodzinę wielomianowych kryteriów wykrywających skorelowane stany mieszane. Rozdział 6 poświęcony jest badaniu typowych własność stanów skorelowanych na zbiorach izospektralnych macierzy gęstości. W Rozdziale 7 znajduje się podsumowanie najważniejszych wyników pracy oraz podana jest lista otwartych problemów związanych z jej tematyką. Rozdział 8 zawiera dowody wyników, które zostały przedstawione bez uzasadnienia w głównej części pracy.

Structure of the thesis

The thesis is organized as follows. The whole material is divided into eight chapters which we list below together with a short description of their content.

- Chapter 1: **Introduction**. We give here the motivation and the context for the research presented in the thesis. We also sketch the main problems that will be treated in the subsequent chapters as well as ideas that will be used to solve them.
- Chapter 2: **Mathematical preliminaries**. We present here the methods of differential geometry and representation theory of Lie groups that will be used in the thesis. We also establish the mathematical notation that will be used latter.
- Chapter 3: **Multilinear criteria for detection of general correlations for pure states**. In this chapter we provide exact multilinear criteria for characterization of various types of correlations for pure quantum states.
- Chapter 4: **Complete characterization of correlations in mixed states**. We discuss here the cases in which it is possible to use the criteria from Chapter 3 to give an analytical characterization of correlations in mixed quantum states.
- Chapter 5: **Polynomial criteria for detection of correlations for mixed states**. We derive a variety of polynomial criteria for detection of correlations in mixed states.
- Chapter 6: **Typical properties of correlation**s. We use here the polynomial criteria derived in the previous chapter to study typical properties of correlations on sets of isospectral density matrices.
- Chapter 7: **Conclusions and outlook**. We summarize here the main contributions of this thesis. We also state the most important open problems related to the results presented in the thesis.
- Chapter 8: **Appendix**. We give here the proofs of the results presented in Chapters 3-6 whose justification was omitted in the main text.

The structure of the chapters that contain the original research (Chapters 3-6) is the following. Each of them begins with the introduction to the topic that will be covered in a given Chapter. This introduction is illustrated by an informally-stated **Problems** around which the rest of the chapter concentrates. The chapter is further divided into sections and subsections which correspond to specific aspects of the given topic. The chapter concludes with the summary of obtained results and a list of open problems related to the content of the chapter.

Throughout the thesis the most important results will be stated in the form of **Theorems**, **Lemmas**, **Propositions** or **Corollaries**. These names correspond to the subjective grading which the author attributes to the obtained results. Some of results might have been published elsewhere but in a different context or with the use of different methods. If we are aware of this we state the appropriate reference. By **Facts** we will always denote results that were known before.

List of publications

Related to the content of the thesis

1. Michał Oszmaniec and Marek Kuś, “On detection of quasiclassical states”, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 45 244034 (2012)
2. Michał Oszmaniec and Marek Kuś, "A universal framework for entanglement detection", Phys. Rev. A 88, 052328 (2013)
3. Michał Oszmaniec and Marek Kuś, “Fraction of isospectral states exhibiting quantum correlations”, Phys. Rev. A 90, 010302(R) (2014)
4. Michał Oszmaniec, Jan Gutt and Marek Kuś, “Classical simulation of fermionic linear optics augmented with noisy ancillas”, Phys. Rev. A 90, 020302(R) (2014)

Not related to the content of the thesis

1. Adam Sawicki, Michał Oszmaniec and Marek Kuś, “Critical sets of the total variance can detect all stochastic local operations and classical communication classes of multiparticle entanglement”, Phys. Rev. A 86, 040304(R) (2012)
2. Tomasz Maciążek, Michał Oszmaniec and Adam Sawicki, “How many invariant polynomials are needed to decide local unitary equivalence of qubit states?”, J. Math. Phys. 54, 092201 (2013)
3. Adam Sawicki, Michał Oszmaniec and Marek Kuś, "The convexity of momentum map, Morse index and Quantum Entanglement", Rev. Math. Phys. 26, 1450004 (2014)
4. Michał Oszmaniec, Piotr Suwara and Adam Sawicki, “Geometry and topology of CC and CQ states”, J. Math. Phys. 55, 062204 (2014)
5. P. Migdał, J. Rodríguez-Laguna, M. Oszmaniec, and M. Lewenstein, “Multiphoton states related via linear optics”, Phys. Rev. A 89, 062329 (2014)

Contents

1. Introduction 7

1.1. General motivation 7

1.2. Outline of the thesis 15

2. Mathematical preliminaries 19

2.1. Standard mathematical structures of quantum mechanics 19

2.2. Methods of entanglement theory 23

2.3. Differential geometry, Lie groups and Lie algebras 28

2.4. Representation theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras 40

3. Multilinear criteria for detection of general correlations for pure states 59

3.1. Quadratic characterization of coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups 60

3.2. Quadratic characterization of the generalized coherent states in the infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces 73

3.3. Multilinear characterization of correlations in pure states 78

3.4. Summary and open problems 87

4. Complete characterization of correlations in mixed states 89

4.1. Classes of coherent states for which Uhlmann–Wotters construction works 90

4.2. Classical simulation of Fermionic Linear Optics augmented with noisy ancillas 100

4.3. Summary and open problems 107

5. Polynomial criteria for detection of correlations for mixed states 109

5.1. Bilinear correlation witnesses based on quadratic characterization of pure non-correlated states 111

5.2. Multilinear correlation witness 117

5.3. Optimal group-invariant bilinear correlation witness 120

5.4. Summary and open problems 136

6. Typical properties of correlations 138

6.1. Introduction to concentration of measure phenomenon 139

6.2. Typical properties of correlations on sets of isospectral density matrices 143

6.3. Summary and open problems 152

7. Summary and outlook 154

8. Appendix 157

8.1. Proofs of results stated in Chapter 3 157

8.2. Proofs of results stated in Chapter 4 162

8.3. Proofs of results stated in Chapter 5 163

8.4. Proofs of results stated in Chapter 6 172

Bibliography 176

Selected symbols and abbreviations used in the thesis.

Symbol	Explanation
$\mathcal{H}$	Hilbert space associated to the considered physical system
$\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$	Tensor product of Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$
$\mathbb{C}^d$	A standard d dimensional complex Hilbert space
$\|\psi\rangle$	Vector from the considered Hilbert space
$\mathbb{I}$	Identity operator on the relevant Hilbert space
$\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})$	k-fold symmetrization of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$
$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},k}$	Orthogonal projector onto $\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})$
$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}$	Orthogonal projector onto $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H})$
$\bigwedge^k(\mathcal{H})$	k-fold anti-symmetrization of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$
$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym},k}$	Orthogonal projector onto $\bigwedge^k(\mathcal{H})$
$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$	Orthogonal projector onto $\bigwedge^2(\mathcal{H})$
$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$	Set of mixed states on Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$
$\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$	Set of pure states on Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$
$\mathcal{H}_d$	The Hilbert space of L distinguishable particles
$\mathcal{H}_b$	The Hilbert space of L bosons
$\mathcal{H}_f$	The Hilbert space of L fermions
$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}(\mathbb{C}^d)$	Fermionic d mode Fock space
$\mathcal{M}$	Non-correlated pure states
$\mathcal{M}^c$	A convex hull of non-correlated pure states (non-correlated mixed states)
$\mathcal{M}_{dist}$	Pure separable states of L particles
$\mathcal{M}_b$	Pure separable states of L bosons
$\mathcal{M}_f$	Projectors onto L partite Slater determinants
$\mathcal{M}_g$	Pure fermionic Gaussian states
A	Non-negative operator on $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$ defining the set $\mathcal{M}$
$\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$	The set of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$
$\mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H})$	The set of Hermitian operators on $\mathcal{H}$
$\mathrm{tr}(X)$	Trace of the operatator $X \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$
$\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$	Special unitary group on $\mathcal{H}$
Ω	The set of isospectral density matrices Ω
K	The symmetry group in question (usually compact and simply-connected)
$\mathfrak{k}$	Lie algebra of a compact Lie group K
$\mathfrak{g}$	Complex semisimple Lie algebra
$\mathfrak{h}$	Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$
Π, π	A representation of a Lie group, respectively Lie algebra
λ	A weight of a
μ	Haar measure on $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$
TQC	Topological quantum computation
FLO	Fermionic linear optics
Ω	Set of isospectral density matrices in $\mathcal{H}$ (for the specified ordered spectrum)
$\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$	Fraction of correlated states on Ω (with respect to the measure induced from μ)

1. Introduction

1.1. General motivation

The notion of quantum correlations does not have a well defined meaning. Usually one uses the term "quantum correlations" to refer to statistical properties of quantum states, describing a particular physical system, that do not have a classical analogue. Consequently, the concept of quantum correlations depends both on the system as well as on the particular physical property in question. Consider the example of bipartite entanglement. In this case the physical system consists of two distinguishable particles (located in spatially separated laboratories). It turns out that quantum mechanics allow statistical correlations among sub-systems of a compound quantum systems that forbid the attribution of properties to the individual parties, even if these are far apart from each other and the global state is well defined [1]. The perception of the phenomenon of entanglement changed drastically over the years. In the famous EPR paper [2] entanglement was considered as an argument against the completeness of quantum mechanics. Nowadays, entanglement is considered as an important physical resource [3, 4] that can be used to perform tasks that would be impossible in a completely classical world. It is therefore natural to characterize the set entangled quantum states. Although this task is relatively easy for pure states, the problem becomes in general very difficult [3, 5] when one wants to characterize entangled mixed states.

This thesis will be concerned with the description of entanglement and types of correlations that are defined in the analogous manner. In our considerations will use extensively technical tools of differential geometry and representation theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras as many types of correlations studied (see Subsection 1.1.2 and Section 1.2) can be conveniently treated within this formalism.

In this section we give a motivation and the context for the work presented in the rest of the Thesis. This section is organized as follows. In Subsection 1.1.1 we review the concept of entanglement, a prototypical example belonging to the class of "quantum correlations" that will be studied in this thesis. In Subsection 1.1.2 motivate types of correlations (other than entanglement) that will be studied in latter chapters. We also explain how differential geometry and Lie groups naturally appear in studies of these kind of problems. We conclude this section in Subsection 1.1.3 where we present briefly examples of correlations that do not fit into the framework considered in this thesis: quantum nonlocality and quantum discord. Throughout this section we will assume the standard notation used in the field of quantum information (see Section 2.1 for the introduction of the notation used in this thesis).

1.1.1. Entanglement of distinguishable particles

The phenomenon of quantum entanglement is one of the most intriguing features of quantum mechanics, not present in the realm of classical physics. It is a direct consequence of the superposition principle applied to the composite quantum system.

Let us introduce the concept of entanglement on the simplest example of two spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles (qbits). The Hilbert space corresponding to this system is a tensor product of Hilbert spaces corresponding to each particle,

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \,,$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{A,B} \approx \mathbb{C}^2$ and the subscripts A, B refer to different particles. In this space we can chose a basis consisting of four states: $|0\rangle|0\rangle$, $|0\rangle|1\rangle$, $|1\rangle|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle|1\rangle$, where vectors $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ form a standard basis of $\mathbb{C}^2$. We say that a pure quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ is separable if and only of it can be written in the form

$$|\psi\rangle = |\psi_A\rangle|\psi_B\rangle \,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $|\psi_{A,B}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{A,B}$ are normalized single-particle states. Pure states that do not have the form (1.1) are called entangled. An important example of an entangled state is so-called Bell state

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0\rangle|1\rangle - |1\rangle|0\rangle\right) \,. \tag{1.2}$$

Even the thought the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is a pure, it is impossible to associate pure states to subsystem associated to each particle. In order to make sense of the preceding statement we recall the notion of the local observables acting on a composite quantum system. The local observables associated to the particle A have the form

$$X_A = X \otimes \mathbb{I}_B \,,$$

where X is an arbitrary Hermitian operator on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathbb{I}_B$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_B$. Analogously, local observables associated to particle B are

$$Y_B = \mathbb{I}_A \otimes Y \,,$$

where Y is an arbitrary Hermitian operator on $\mathcal{H}_B$ and $\mathbb{I}_A$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_A$. The expectation values of local observables on the state $|\Psi\rangle$ are given by

$$\langle\Psi|X \otimes \mathbb{I}_B|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,(X) \;,\; \langle\Psi|\mathbb{I}_A \otimes Y|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,(Y) \;, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\mathrm{tr}\,(\cdot)$ is a trace of the operator. By the virtue of Eq.(1.3) the expectation values of local measurements performed on a system in state $|\Psi\rangle$ depend on local observables only through traces of X and Y respectively. Consequently, it is impossible to associate pure states $|\psi_A\rangle$, $|\psi_B\rangle$ that would describe the "local states" of particles A and B respectively. In fact, the only choice of local states consistent with (1.3) is to associate maximally mixed states to each particle (see Subsection 2.1).

The state $|\Psi\rangle$ can be also used to demonstrate the essential idea of the EPR paradox and is an example of a state exhibiting quantum nonlocality (see Subsection 1.1.3). The definition of entanglement for mixed quantum states is more involved. A two qbit mixed state ρ is said to be separable if and only if it can expressed as a probabilistic mixture of pure separable states. In other words

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \,, \tag{1.4}$$

where $p_i \geq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i = 1$ and the states[1] $|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ are separable (note that the presentation 1.4 is in general non-unique). A mixed state ρ is called entangled if and only if it is not separable.

[1] Throughout this thesis we identify pure quantum states with orthonormal projectors onto one dimensional subspaces in the Hilbert space of a system. However, for the sake of simplicity, we will ignore in this chapter the difference between states (denoted by $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$) and their vector representatives (denoted by $|\psi\rangle$).

We now sketch, following [6], the reasoning leading to this definition of entanglement in general mixed states. Let us notice that for the product pure qbit states (i.e. states of the form $\rho = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$) the joint measurements of quantum observables corresponding to each particle factorize

$$\mathrm{tr}\left([\rho_A \otimes \rho_B]\, X \otimes Y\right) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_A X\right) \cdot \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_B Y\right) .$$

Therefore the statistics measurements of observables associated to each particle are described by independent random variables (for any choice of single particle observables X, Y). Consequently, if the state of the system is of the form $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B$, then the simultaneous measurement of local observables correspond to performing the separate experiments on two separate systems (described respectively by the state ρ_A and ρ_B). The correlations can be introduced into the system if one has a generator of states that generates, with the probability p_j, a product state $\rho_A^j \otimes \rho_B^j$ ($i = 1, \ldots, M$). Now the quantum state describing the statistical ensemble generated in this way is given by

$$\rho = \sum_{j=1}^{M} p_j \rho_A^j \otimes \rho_B^j \,. \tag{1.5}$$

The observation that every state ρ of the form (1.5) can be casted in the form (1.4) and vice versa motivates the definition of entanglement introduced above [2]. We have presented the concept of entanglement on the example of two qbit system. The generalization to multipartite setting and general single particle Hilbert spaces is straightforward.

The quantum entanglement is not only a peculiarity of quantum mechanics. It is one of the cornerstones of the field of quantum information and can be used as a resource to perform tasks that classically are either impossible or very inefficient to implement. The examples include: quantum teleportation [8], superdense coding [9] and quantum key distribution [10, 11] and precise quantum metrology [12]. Although these applications are the primary reason for the interest in entanglement, we limit ourselves only to giving a short list given above. For an overview of the role of entanglement in quantum information and quantum computing see [3].

Let us conclude our considerations by a simple, yet profound observation. The separability problem, i.e. a problem to decide whether a given mixed quantum state is entangled or not, admits an important symmetry. The set of pure separable states is invariant under the transformations of the form[3]

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \to |\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'| = U_A \otimes U_B |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| U_A^\dagger \otimes U_B^\dagger \,,$$

where U_A and U_B are arbitrary unitary operators acting on particle A and B respectively. Unitary operator of the form $U_A \otimes U_B$ form a group called the local unitary group LU. This group encodes unitary local evolutions of a composite system. Every two pure separable states can be transformed onto each other by the conjugation via some element of a local unitary group. Therefore the property of being entangled is invariant under the action of the local unitary group. The local unitary group is the product of Lie groups, $\mathrm{LU} = \mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{SU}(2)$, and thus is itself a Lie group[4]. The above reasoning establishes a connection between the separability problem and the theory of Lie groups and differential geometry. In this part we give a list of concrete types of correlations that will be investigated and discuss briefly their physical relevance.

[2] For the alternative motivation of such a definition, involving the possible application of an entangled state to certain quantum information processing tasks using LOCC protocols, see [7].

[3] We focused on the case of two qbits but the analogous statements hold also for the multipartite scenarios and for the arbitrary single particle Hilbert spaces.

[4] The group $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ denotes the group of complex unitary 2×2 matrices having a unit determinant.

1.1.2. A generalized separability problem

Throughout this thesis we will be studying types of correlations that can be defined formally in analogous manner to entanglement of distinguishable particles. For this type of correlations one first specifies a class of "non-correlated" pure states. The correlated states are then defined as states that cannot be represented as probabilistic combinations of pure "non-correlated states".

Correlations in systems with fixed number of non-distinguishable particles.

There exist different approaches to define entanglement for systems consisting of fixed number of identical bosons or fermions. This is caused by the fact that in these systems the underlying Hilbert space is no longer a product of Hilbert spaces of individual subsystems but rather a symmetric and antisymmetric part of it. Moreover, due to non-distinguishablility of bosons and fermions it is impossible to access operationally individual particles (via local operations or measurements). The Hilbert spaces associated to system of L bosons and respectively L fermions are

$$\mathcal{H}_b = \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \ , \ \mathcal{H}_f = \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}) \ , \tag{1.6}$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ is a single-particle Hilbert space. By the virtue of (1.6) most pure bosonic and every pure fermionic state can be treated as an entangled state of a system of L identical distinguishable particles. But since the access to the designated subsystems is restricted by indistinguishably, what is the use of this kind of entanglement? For this reason the particle entanglement described above is treated sometimes as a mathematical artifact [13, 14], not as a useful resource (like the usual entanglement of distinguishable particles). In this thesis we will not discuss further the problem of the definition of the concept of entanglement for non-distinguishable particles which is a subject of an ongoing debate (c.f. [14, 15, 16]). Instead, using the analogy with the case of entanglement, we will investigate the notions of correlations defined with the use of the simplest pure states available in $\mathcal{H}_b$ and $\mathcal{H}_f$ respectively.

In the case of L identical bosons we will study particle entanglement. In this scenario non-entangled pure states are of the form form

$$|\psi\rangle = |\phi\rangle^{\otimes L} , \tag{1.7}$$

where $|\phi\rangle$ is an arbitrary normalized vector from the single particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ describing a single bosonic particle. Just like in the case of distinguishable particles, non-correlated (non-entangled) mixed states are defined as probabilistic mixtures of states of the form (1.7). Such a definition is motivated by the fact that it is useful many physical contexts.

- In a recent paper [16] it was shown that particle entanglement of bosons can be activated, via the procedure of mode splitting, to the "true" entanglement of distinguishable particles.
- Product bosonic states (1.7) appear as variational states in the Hartree-Fock method applied to weakly interacting bosonic systems [17].
- Entangled bosonic states (in a sense of the above definition) are necessary to achieve "Heisenberg scaling" quantum metrology with L photonic states [12].
- States of the form (1.7), for finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, are precisely coherent states of the group SU (N) in $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$, where $N = \dim(\mathcal{H})$. For $N = 2$ we recover Bloch coherent states [18, 19] for spin $s = \frac{N-1}{2}$.

In systems consisting of L identical fermions we define non-correlated pure states as states that can be expressed as a single Slater determinant,

$$|\psi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \wedge |\phi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\phi_L\rangle , \tag{1.8}$$

where vectors $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{L}$ are arbitrary normalized and pairwise orthogonal states form the single particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. As before non-correlated ("separable") mixed fermionic states are defined as states being convex combinations of Slater determinants. Such a definition is motivated by the following observations:

- States of the form (1.8) are the simplest tensors available in $\mathcal{H}_f$ [20, 21].
- Slater determinants are used as variational class of states in the Hartee-Fock method applied to fermionic (e.g., electron) systems [17].
- Slater determinants (1.8) are, for finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, precisely coherent states of the group SU (N) in $\bigwedge^{L}(\mathcal{H})$, where $N = \dim(\mathcal{H})$.

Non-convex-Gaussian correlations in fermionic systems

Another interesting type of correlations that can be defined in an analogous manner to entanglement are non-convex-Gaussian correlations in fermionic systems [22]. In this scenario one considers a fermionic system in which fermions can occupy d modes, but the total number of particles can be arbitrary[5]. Consequently, the appropriate Hilbert space associated to this system is d mode Fermionic Fock space[6] $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. We fix the class of non-correlated pure states to consist of pure fermionic Gaussian states [22, 23]. Consequently, the set pf non-correlated mixed states consists of convex-Gaussian states, i.e. states that are probabilistic (convex) combinations of pure Gaussian states. This kind of correlations is relevant for models of quantum computation based on fermionic Linear Optics [22] and Topological Quantum Computation with so-called Ising anyons [24] (see Section 4.2 for details). Moreover, pure fermionic Gaussian states are also used as variational states in Bogolyubov-Hartee-Fock mean field theory [17, 25]. Lastly, pure Gaussian states are also called "pure spinors" and are "coherent sates" of spinor representations of the Lie group Spin $(2d)$.

A unified picture

The examples of correlations given above (entanglement, particle entanglement of bosons, "entanglement" of fermions, non-convex-Gaussian fermionic correlations) share an important common feature. In each of these examples there exist a continuous symmetry group acting on the Hilbert space of the system in question and the class of non-correlated pure states consists of "coherent states" of the action of this group [26]. For this reason the so-defined correlations are invariant under the action of this group (in the case of entanglement this group is the local unitary group). Exactly the same situation occurs in the case of coherent optical sates[7] [19]. In this scenario the non-correlated mixed states are states possessing the positive P representation (in the context of quantum optics such states are also called classical states).

A unified perspective for studing such types of correlations was put forward in [27]. In the cited article authors introduced in the notion of "generalized entanglement" defined by specifying "non-entangled" states as convex combinations of general coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups (see also [28]). In this work we will study mainly these types of correlations, focusing on the generalized separability problem, i.e. a problem to characterize (for a given scenario) the set of non-correlated mixed states. We will investigate the following aspects of this problem (see Section 1.2 for details).

[5] Due to the Fermi exclusion principle the number of particles present in such a system cannot exceed d.

[6] For the precise definitions of this space and other objects that appear in this part see Subsections 2.4.4 and 3.1.5).

[7] In this case the relevant Hilbert space is the Bosonic Fock space and the coherent states are generated from the vacuum by the action of displacement operators.

1. Characterization of the set of non-correlated pure states via zeros of polynomial in state's density matrix.
2. An analytical characterization for the set of non-correlated mixed states (in special cases).
3. Derivation of the family of polynomial criteria detecting correlations in mixed states of the system in question.
4. How typical are correlated states among all mixed states of the considered quantum system?

In addition to the correlations defined via coherent states of a suitable symmetry group, we will also study the generalized separability problem for more general classes of states. In particular we will study the "refined" notions of entanglement:

- Genuine multiparty entanglement for multipartite systems of distinguishable particles [3, 5]
- Refined classification of bipartite entanglement based on the notion of the Schmidt number of a quantum states [29].

In the above cases one also defines the suitable classes non-correlated pure states (see Subsections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 for details) which are preserved by the action of the relevant symmetry group.

We would like to emphasize the importance of the role of symmetry groups in the scheme presented above. The presence of the symmetries allow us to use methods belonging to the realm of differential geometry and representation theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras. These methods allow to tackle problems that otherwise would have been very difficult or impossible to solve. Such mathematical techniques have been used before in entanglement theory. The following aspects of entanglement were successfully treated via geometric and group-theoretic methods.

- Local unitary equivalence of multipartite pure states[8]. This problem has been investigated with the usage of symplectic geometry [30, 31] as well as the method of group-invariant polynomials [32, 33, 34].
- Characterization of various classes of entanglement in pure states for the multipartite setting [35, 36, 37, 38, 39].

However, to our knowledge, the geometric and group-theoretic methods were not applied systematically to study the generalized separability problem. Filling up this gap is the aim of this thesis.

In the end of this part we would like to mention that the results presented in work are of the independent interest in pure mathematics. The class of the non-correlated mixed states in the generalized separability problem is an example of an orbitope [40]. An orbitope is defined as a convex hull of an orbit of a linear action of a Lie group acting in a vector space. Orbitopes have became recently a subject of active mathematical studies [40, 41, 42, 43].

1.1.3. Quantum nonlocality and quantum discord

Not all types correlations of appearing in the quantum information theory have the form presented in the preceding paragraph. Here we illustrate this fact by briefly discussing two examples of such correlations: quantum nonlocality [44] and quantum discord [45].

[8] We say that two pure states $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ and $|\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|$ are locally unitary equivalent if and only if one can be transferred onto another by some local unitary operation.

Quantum nonlocality

In order to introduce the concept of quantum nonlocality we first define the so-called Bell scenario. Consider two observers (called Alice and Bob) that are located in specially separated laboratories and can perform independent experiments on a certain physical system. We assume that during each experimental run each observer can independently chose one of 2 observables (we denote Alice's and Bob's observables by x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 respectively) that can give 2 different results[9] (labeled by a_1, a_2 and b_1, b_2 for Alice and Bob respectively). Under the assumption that each measurement setup is equally probable the statistics of joint measurement of Alice and Bob are completely described via the collection of conditional probabilities

$$p\left(ab|xy\right)\ ,\ a\in\left\{a_1,a_2\right\},\ b\in\left\{b_1,b_2\right\},\ x\in\left\{x_1,x_2\right\},\ y\in\left\{y_1,y_2\right\}\ .$$

The collection of probabilities $p\left(ab|xy\right)$ is said to be admit a local model if and only if for each measurement setting xy we have

$$p\left(ab|xy\right)=\int_{\Lambda}p\left(a|x,\lambda\right)p\left(b|y,\lambda\right)p\left(\lambda\right)d\lambda\,, \tag{1.9}$$

where Λ is the space of "hidden parameters" equipped with the measure $p\left(\lambda\right)d\lambda$. Functions $p\left(a|x,\lambda\right)$ and $p\left(b|y,\lambda\right)$ describe the results of measurements of Alice and Bob, conditioned on the knowledge of the hidden variable $\lambda\in\Lambda$.

Assume now that the conditional probabilities $p\left(ab|xy\right)$ come from quantum mechanics, i.e. there exist a two qbit state ρ such that

$$p\left(ab|xy\right)=\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{E_a^x}\otimes\mathrm{E_b^y}\rho\right),$$

where operators $\left\{E_a^x\right\}_{a=a_1,a_2}$ and $\left\{E_b^y\right\}_{b=b_1,b_2}$ describe local measurements of Alice and respectively, Bob for each choice of the measurement setting xy (for fixed xy and each pair of indices a,b operators E_a^x, E_b^y are rank one orthonormal projectors in $\mathbb{C}^2$). Let us inverse the picture and take as a primary object the two qbit quantum state ρ. A state ρ posses a local hidden variable model (LVM) [10] if and only if for every choice of local measurements $\left\{E_a^x\right\}_{a=a_1,a_2}$ and $\left\{E_b^y\right\}_{b=b_1,b_2}$ the corresponding sets of conditional probabilities $p\left(ab|xy\right)$ admit are local (in a sense of Eq.(1.9)).

States that do not admit a local hidden variable model are said to exhibit quantum nonlocality. An example of such a state is already the mentioned maximally entangled Bell state $|\Psi\rangle$ (see Eq.(1.2)). This fact was used in the famous Bell paper [46] to show that some predictions of quantum mechanics cannot be reproduced by theories admitting local hidden variables (understood in a sense of Eq.(1.9)).

States that admit LMV form a convex set. However this set is not a convex hull of some class of pure states. In particular in [6] it was showed that in the set of states admitting LMV is strictly larger than the set of separable states.

[9] The generalization to arbitrary number of measurement setting and measurement outcomes is straightforward.

[10] We do not describe here the philosophical justification for the name "local hidden variable model", focusing only on the technical definition of this concept. For a complete justification see for example [44].

Quantum discord

Let us first recall the concept of the mutual information of two discrete random variable A, B, characterized by the joint probability distribution $p_{A,B}(a,b)$ (indices a, b run over some implicit discrete set of indices). We denote by $p_A(a)$ ($p_B(b)$) the marginal distribution of the random variable A (respectively B). The mutual information, denoted by $I(A,B)$, is defined by

$$I(A,B) = H(A) + H(B) - H(A,B) \ , \tag{1.10}$$

where $H(A)$ is the Shannon entropy of the random variable A,

$$H(A) = -\sum_a p_A(a) \ln\left(p_A(a)\right) \ .$$

and $H(A,B)$ is the joint entropy of variables A and B,

$$H(A,B) = -\sum_{a,b} p_{A,B}(a,b) \ln\left(p_{A,B}(a,b)\right) \ .$$

The mutual information $I(A,B)$ can be considered as a measure of how much more information is obtained during a singe measurement of two variables A, B jointly, as opposed to measuring variables A, B separately. The mutual information can be also considered as an indicator of correlations between X and Y as it is non-negative and vanish if and only the joint probability distribution has the product form, $p_{A,B}(a,b) = p_A(a) \cdot p_B(b)$. There exist another equivalent formula for the mutual information,

$$I(A,B) = H(A) - H(A|B) \ , \tag{1.11}$$

where $H(A|B)$ is the conditional entropy given by

$$H(A|B) = \sum_b p_B(b) \left[-\sum_a p_A(a|b) \ln\left(p_A(a|b)\right) \right] \ ,$$

where $p_a(a|b) = \frac{p_{A,B}(a,b)}{p_B(b)}$ is the probability of the random variable A conditioned on the value of the random variable B.

The concept of quantum discord, introduced independently in [47] and [48], stems form the fact that two classically equivalent formulas (1.10) and (1.11) for $I(A,B)$ do not give the same results in the quantum domain. In quantum mechanics the immediate generalization of the $I(A,B)$ is quantum mutual information defined on the two party state ρ^{AB} (we apply the usual convention: symbols A and B refer to different subsystems of a composite system). It is given by

$$I\left(\rho^{AB}\right) = S\left(\rho^A\right) + S\left(\rho^B\right) - S\left(\rho^{AB}\right) ,$$

where $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho \ln(\rho)\right)$ is the von-Neumann entropy of the density matrix ρ and ρ^A, ρ^B denote one particle reduced density matrices of the state ρ^{AB}. Another possible generalization of $I(A,B)$ involves Eq.(1.11) and uses the notion of quantum conditional entropy. In difference to the classical case, in quantum mechanics the conditional entropy of a state ρ^{XY} depends on the measurement scenario used in the second subsystem

$$S\left(A|\left\{E_b\right\}\right) = \sum_b p_b S\left(\rho_{A|b}\right) \ , \tag{1.12}$$

where $\{E_b\}$ is a collection of generalized measurements[11] performed in the subsystems B, $p_b = \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{I} \otimes E_b \rho^{AB}\right)$ and $\rho_{A|b} = \frac{1}{p_b} \mathrm{tr}_B \left(\mathbb{I} \otimes E_b \rho^{AB}\right)$ (for the definition of partial trace $\mathrm{tr}_B(\cdot)$ see Subsection 2.1). Using (1.12) and (1.11) one obtains another generalization of $I(A,B)$,

$$\mathcal{J}\left(A|\left\{E_b\right\}\right) = S\left(\rho^A\right) - S\left(A|\left\{E_b\right\}\right) .$$

The quantum discord, denoted by $\mathcal{D}(A|B)$, is now defined by [47, 48]

$$\mathcal{D}(A|B) = \max_{\{E_b\}} \left[I\left(\rho^{AB}\right) - \mathcal{J}\left(A|\left\{E_b\right\}\right)\right] ,$$

where the optimization is over all generalized local measurements on the subsystem B. The quantum discord is a measure of correlations more general than entanglement. It is non-negative and invariant under the action of local unitary group [45]. Moreover, non-correlated states (states with the vanishing quantum discord) must be of the form of so called quantum-classical states, i.e.

$$\rho^{AB} = \sum_i p_i \sigma_i \otimes |i\rangle\langle i| , \tag{1.13}$$

where $\{p_i\}$ is a probability distribution, σ_i are arbitrary quantum states on the first subsystem and $\{|i\rangle\}$ form the orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space associated to the second subsystem. States of the form (1.13) do not form a convex set [48]. Consequently, correlations defined with the usage of quantum discord cannot be captured in the framework presented in Subsection 1.1.2. Interestingly enough, the class of quantum classical states can be effectively described with the framework of symplectic geometry [50].

1.2. Outline of the thesis

Throughout this work we will be studing the notion of correlations which comes from the generalization of the entanglement problem (see Section 1.1). We start with the subset $\mathcal{M}$ of the set of all pure states $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ of interest,

$$\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}) . \tag{1.14}$$

In what follows we will refer to $\mathcal{M}$ as to the set of "non-correlated" pure states. Consequently, all states that do not belong to $\mathcal{M}$ are called correlated. One can imagine that (just like the case of the entanglement problem, where $\mathcal{M}$ consisted of pure separable states) we have an easy access to "free" ore "simple" states from the class $\mathcal{M}$. In analogy to the case of entanglement we extend the notion of correlations to the realm of mixed states $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ of the considered system. We now define the class on "non-correlated" mixed states, denoted by $\mathcal{M}^c$, as states that can be obtained as probabilistic mixtures (convex combinations) of pure states from the set $\mathcal{M}$ (treated as a subset of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$),

$$\mathcal{M}^c = \left\{ \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \;\middle|\; \sum_i p_i = 1,\, p_i \geq 0\,,\, |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \in \mathcal{M} \right\} . \tag{1.15}$$

In the language of convex geometry the resulting set is called the *convex hull* of the set $\mathcal{M}$ (which explain the notation we used). Just like in the case of pure states we define mixed correlated states as states that do not belong to the set $\mathcal{M}^c$. The pictorial representation of the above construction is given in Figure 1.1.

[11] The generalized measurements in quantum mechanics are given by a positive operator-valued measure [49], i.e. a collection of non-negative operators $\{E_\alpha\}$ such that $\sum_\alpha E_\alpha = \mathbb{I}$. The probability of the outcome α if the system is in the state ρ is given by $p_\alpha = \mathrm{tr}(E_\alpha)$.



Figure 1.1. Pictorial representation of the definition of correlated states (with respect to the choice of $\mathcal{M}$)

In the above discussion we did not specified the structure of the set $\mathcal{M}$, the class of "correlations" it represents, nor the concrete physical system of interest. In fact, on the technical level, we simply associated the "lack of correlations" to states belonging to $\mathcal{M}$ and extended this notion to the problem of entanglement. However we want to stress that the language introduced above allows to study at the same footing many types of correlations that bear a physical meaning (see Section 1.1 for the list of examples). Throughout the thesis we will limit ourselves to classes of states $\mathcal{M}$ that can be defined as the zero set of a non-negative homogenous polynomial in the state's density matrix

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right] A\right) = 0\,, \tag{1.16}$$

where A is the non-negative operator on the k-fold symmetrization of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. In fact the expression $\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right] A\right)$, for a suitable choice of the operator A, can be used to define arbitrary homogenous non-negative polynomial[12] in pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. The equation (1.16) will be the leitmotif that will be used throughout the thesis. In Chapters 3-6, which form the core of the thesis, we will investigate the natural problems and questions concerning the types of correlations defined above.

In **Chapter 3** we will show that many classes of pure states naturally appearing in quantum information and quantum many body physics can be defined via the condition (1.16), for a suitable choice of the polynomial $\mathcal{P}$. The examples include:

1. Product states for L distinguishable particles.
2. Product states for L bosons.
3. Slater determinants for L fermions.
4. Pure fermionic Gaussian states.
5. Multipartite states that do not exhibit genuine multiparty entanglement.
6. Bipartite states with a bounded Schmidt rank.

The notions of correlations corresponding to each choice of the class of non-coherent states were discussed in Section 1.1. In fact this is not an accident that many classes of pure states

[12] By a homogenous polynomial $\mathcal{P}$ defined on a set of Hermitian operator X we understand a function which is a homogenous polynomial in matrix elements $\langle i|X|j\rangle$ of the operator X. For instance, for 2×2 Hermitian matrix $X = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b^* & c \end{pmatrix}$ an exemplary homogenous real polynomial is $\mathcal{P}(X) = a^2 + |b|^2 + c^2$.

relevant to quantum physics can be characterized by the condition (1.16). We show that this is a consequence of the existence of the symmetry group that can be used to define the class $\mathcal{M}$. To be more precise we show that it is possible to construct a polynomial $\mathcal{P}$ for classes of states which consist of "the generalized Perelomov coherent states" of the symmetry group K irreducibly represented in the (usually finite-dimensional) Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ (see Figure 1.2).



Figure 1.2. An graphical presentation of the set of "generalized Perelomov coherent states" $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ viewed as an orbit of the action of the symmetry group K through the state $|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$. The group K is irreducibly represented, via the representation Π, in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

We focus mostly[13] on situations when the group K is compact and simply-connected. This class of groups is broad enough to cover cases 1-4 from the list above. Moreover, this restriction allows us to use the representation theory of semisimple Lie algebras[14]. This technical tool allows us to write down explicitly the operator A that characterizes a given class of pure states.

In **Chapter 4** we ask in witch cases the characterization (1.16) allows for a simple analytical characterization of the set of non-correlated mixed states $\mathcal{M}^c$. We partially answer this question by classifying all the cases when Perelomov coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups can be characterized by a single anti-unitary conjugation. This allows to characterize the set $\mathcal{M}^c$ analytically via the Uhlmann-Wotters construction (c.f. the discussion of Wotters concurrence in Subsection 2.2). We also apply our results to characterize analytically the set of pure fermionic Gaussian states for four fermionic modes. As pointed out in Section 1.1 this has a consequence in the theory of quantum computation.

In **Chapter 5** we use the characterization (1.16) of pure uncorrelated states to derive polynomial criteria cor detection of correlation in mixed states. In particular, starting just from the condition (1.16) we provide a universal way to construct "nonlinear witnesses of correlations" in mixed states. This is a new method of constructing witnesses of correlations different than entanglement. Moreover, for classes 1-4 from the list above we describe completely the structure of bilinear group-invariant criteria detecting correlations.

Chapter 6 deals the following question: are correlated states defined via Eq.(1.16) and the above construction typical among all possible mixed states of the system? We answer this question partially by estimating from below the fraction of correlated states on the manifold of

[13] A part of Chapter 3 is also devoted to cases when $\mathcal{H}$ is infinite-dimensional and K is not even a Lie group.

[14] As explained in Chapter 2 to every compact simply-connected Lie group K one can associate a complex semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

isospectral density matrices[15]. In order to achieve these bounds (they depend on the polynomial $\mathcal{P}$ from Eq.(1.16)) we use the criteria introduced in Chapter 5 and the technique of concentration of measure.

The chapters we listed above are related to each other and shed a light on the mathematical structure of correlations defined via the choice of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ given by Eq.(1.16). Many techniques that we use in this thesis comes form differential geometry and representation theory of Lie groups. As these branches of mathematics are not commonly used in quantum information theory we present the necessary background in these fields in **Chapter 2**. The relations between Chapters 3-6, with indicated aspects in which differential geometry and representation theory are employed, are presented in Figure 1.3.



Figure 1.3. A graphical presentation of the connections between the core chapters of the thesis, with indicated applications of differential geometry and representation theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras. The indices labeling arrows have the following meaning: (i) Actions of Lie groups on spheres, (ii) Concentration of measure on manifolds of isospectral density matrices, (a) Perelomov coherent states, (b) Representation theory of compact Lie groups, (c) Structure of irreducible representations of semisimple Lie algebras, (d) dimensions of certain irreducible representations of semisimple Lie algebras.

[15] The manifold of isospectral density matrices consists of states in the considered Hilbert space that have a fixed spectrum. It is equipped with the natural invariant measure coming form the Haar measure on the unitary group of the Hilbert space.

2. Mathematical preliminaries

The purpose of this chapter is to present the mathematical concepts and the terminology that will be used in the rest of the thesis. In the first part of the chapter we sketch the standard algebraic formulation of quantum mechanics. We use this opportunity to establish the notation that will be used throughout the text. In the second part of the chapter we give a survey of basic facts from differential geometry and theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras. In the third section we review methods of entanglement theory that are relevant for this thesis. The third section contains some basic material from differential geometry. In the last part of the chapter we briefly describe representation theory of Lie groups and algebras, with emphasis on the representation theory of compact simply-connected Lie groups and semisimple Lie algebras. We will not be concerned here with functional-analytical details and more advanced differential geometry. Whenever necessary, appropriate mathematics will be presented in relevant parts of the thesis.

2.1. Standard mathematical structures of quantum mechanics

The basic object in quantum mechanics is a complex separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ which is associated with every physical system.

Definition 2.1. A complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a complex vector space equipped with the $1\frac{1}{2}$ linear product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ such that the space is complete with respect to the norm $\|\psi\| = \sqrt{\langle\psi|\psi\rangle}$ induced by the inner product. A Hilbert space is called separable if it has a countable basis.

In the context of quantum information theory one usually deals with finite dimensional Hilbert spaces and for this reason we do not need to bother with the separability condition in most cases considered in this thesis. Nevertheless, when necessary, functional-analytic details related to infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces will be provided. Throughout the rest of this chapter we assume that the dimension of $\mathcal{H}$ is finite. We adopt the usual physical convention that the inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ is anti-linear in the first argument and linear in the second argument,

$$\langle\alpha\phi|\psi\rangle = \bar{\alpha}\langle\phi|\psi\rangle,\ \langle\phi|\alpha\psi\rangle = \alpha\langle\phi|\psi\rangle,\ \phi,\psi\in\mathcal{H},\ \alpha\in\mathbb{C}\,.$$

We will also use the "bra-ket" physical notation which is in agreement with the above convention. For any vector $\psi\in\mathcal{H}$ we identify ψ with the "ket" $|\psi\rangle$. By the "bra" $\langle\psi|$ we understand the linear form on $\mathcal{H}$ given by the pairing $\mathcal{H}\ni\phi\to\langle\psi|\phi\rangle\in\mathbb{C}$. To every Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ we have associated the space of linear operators acting on $\mathcal{H}$ which we denote by $\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$ and a space of invertible linear operators $\mathrm{GL}\,(\mathcal{H})$. For every operator $A\in\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$ we define its Hermitian conjugate $A^\dagger$ via the relation,

$$\langle\phi|A\psi\rangle = \langle A^\dagger\phi|\psi\rangle\,,\ |\phi\rangle,\ |\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}\,.$$

Throughout the thesis we will also use the notation commonly used in the folklore of quantum mechanics: $\langle\phi|A\psi\rangle\equiv\langle\phi|A|\psi\rangle$.

The space $\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$ carries a natural Hilbert space structure given by the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product,

$$\langle A|B\rangle_{\mathrm{HS}} = \mathrm{tr}\left(A^\dagger B\right)\,,\; A,B\in \mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})\;.$$

In the above expression $\mathrm{tr}\,(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of the linear operator. In quantum mechanics the special role is played by Hermitian operators, i.e., operators $A\in\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying the condition $A^\dagger = A$. We denote the set of Hermitian operators by $\mathrm{Herm}\,(\mathcal{H})$. Hermitian operators are diagonalizable and have real eigenvalues, i.e. they can be presented as

$$A = \sum_i \lambda_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where λ_i denote real eigenvalues of A and $|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ denote the orthonormal projectors onto one dimensional subspaces spanned by the normalized eigenvectors $|\psi_i\rangle\in\mathcal{H}$ ($\langle\psi_i|\psi_i\rangle = 1$). Vectors $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ form the orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$. Note that we can have $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$ for $i\neq j$. In such a case the spectrum of A is said to be degenerated.

Definition 2.2. A set of non-negative operators on $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathrm{Herm}_+\,(\mathcal{H})$, consists of Hermitian operators satisfying $\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle\geq 0$ for all $|\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}$. Equivalently, non-negative operators can be characterized as Hermitian operators that have non-negative eigenvalues. We will write $A\geq 0$ for $A\in\mathrm{Herm}_+\,(\mathcal{H})$.

We will write $A\geq B$ if operators $A,B\in\mathrm{Herm}\,(\mathcal{H})$ satisfy $A-B\geq 0$. General states of a quantum system can be characterized as subsets of $\mathrm{Herm}_+\,(\mathcal{H})$.

Definition 2.3. Pure states on $\mathcal{H}$ are defined as rank-1 orthogonal projectors acting on $\mathcal{H}$. General mixed states on $\mathcal{H}$ are defined as operators ρ satisfying $\rho\geq 0$ and $\mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho) = 1$. We denote sets of pure and mixed states by $\mathcal{D}_1\,(\mathcal{H})$ a $\mathcal{D}\,(\mathcal{H})$ respectively.

Observables on a quantum system $\mathcal{H}$ (assuming no super-selection rules are present) are identified with Hermitian operators $A\in\mathrm{Herm}\,(\mathcal{H})$. In general the value of the physical quantity associated to an operator A is not specified before the actual measurement takes place. Possible values of measurements of A are elements of its spectrum. Assume that the system is in a mixed state ρ. The probability that as a result of the measurement one obtains the value λ is given by $\mathrm{tr}\,(\rho\mathbb{P}_\lambda)$, where $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$ is the projector onto the subspace spanned by eigenvectors of A for which the corresponding eigenvalue equals λ (see (2.1)). Consequently, the expectation value of the observable described by the operator A is given by $\mathrm{tr}\,(\rho A)$.

Another important class of operators on $\mathcal{H}$ are unitary operators, i.e. operators $U\in\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$ which satisfy $U^\dagger = U^{-1}$. The set of unitary operators is closed under composition and forms a group which we denote by $\mathrm{U}\,(\mathcal{H})$. One parameter family of unitary operators specify the time evolution of an isolated quantum system. It is given by

$$\rho_t = \mathrm{e}^{-itH}\rho_0\mathrm{e}^{itH}\,, \tag{2.2}$$

where ρ_0 is the initial state of the system and ρ_t is the state of the system at time t. Operator H is a distinguished Hermitian operator known as the Hamiltonian of the system[1]. Hermiticity of H ensures that the time evolution operator $U_t = \mathrm{e}^{-itH}$ is unitary, $U_t^\dagger = U_t^{-1}$. If we are allowed to perform an arbitrary evolution on a quantum system system the set of possible transformations are given by $\rho\to U\rho U^\dagger$, where $U\in\mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H})$.

So far we have discussed only isolated quantum systems. If a quantum system consists of two subsystems A and B, the total Hilbert space is given by the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}_B$, where

[1] In (2.2) we assumed that we work in unit system in which the Planck constant equals one, $\hbar = 1$

$\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ are Hilbert spaces describing subsystems A and B respectively. For the general discussion and definition of the tensor product of Hilbert spaces see [49]. Here we present only basic properties of $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ and omit their proofs. The space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is spanned by vectors of the form $\psi \otimes \phi$, where $\otimes : \mathcal{H}_A \times \mathcal{H}_B \to \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is a nontrivial bilinear mapping. Vectors of the form $\psi \otimes \phi$ are called separable vectors or simple tensors. The inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B}$ on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is defined in terms of the inner products of Hilbert spaces describing subsystem A and B: $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A}$ and $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_B}$. For simple tensors we have

$$\langle \psi_1 \otimes \phi_1 | \psi_2 \otimes \phi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B} = \langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A} \langle \phi_1 | \phi_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_B} .$$

The inner product between arbitrary vectors from $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ is defined by demanding linearity in the second and anti-linearity in the first argument of $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B}$. In what follows we will drop the subscripts in the inner products corresponding to different subsystems. Also, in the Dirac "bra-ket" notation introduced earlier we will use interchangeably, unless it causes a confusion, the following forms:

$$\langle \psi \otimes \phi | \equiv \langle \psi | \otimes \langle \phi | \equiv \langle \psi | \langle \phi | , \, | \psi \otimes \phi \rangle \equiv | \psi \rangle \otimes | \phi \rangle \equiv | \psi \rangle | \phi \rangle .$$

Assume now that the joint system is in the state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$. We want to compute the expectation value of an observable $A \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ which is local, i.e. takes the form $A = \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \tilde{A}$, where $\mathbb{I}_A$ is the identity on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\tilde{A} \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H}_B)$. It turns out that the expectation value of ρ on such A can by expressed via the "local part" of ρ. More precisely, for a given $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ there exist a unique state $\rho_B \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ such that for all $\tilde{A} \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ we have,

$$\mathrm{tr}\left[\rho \left(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \tilde{A}\right)\right] = \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_B \tilde{A}\right) . \tag{2.3}$$

Operator ρ_B is called the partial trace (over the subsystem A) of ρ. In what follows we will use the notation $\rho_B = \mathrm{tr}_A(\rho)$. The operation of partial trace is $\mathbb{R}$-linear in ρ and can be extended to the $\mathbb{C}$-linear mapping $\mathrm{tr}_A : \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ which preserves Hermiticity. In an analogous manner we define the partial trace over subsystem B. The same construction can be introduced for systems that consist of many subsystems. In such cases the total Hilbert space has a structure of multiple tensor product $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_L$, where L is a number of subsystems.

We now describe the most general dynamics that the quantum system, described by the initial state $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, can undergo. Let ρ denote the state after the evolution and let Λ be the map defining this evolution. We demand that the evolution to be linear in ρ and thus respects the linear structure on $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$. Also, whatever happens during the evolution, the final state ρ must remain positive semi-definiteness if the evolved state $\tilde{\rho}$ has to be interpreted as some density matrix. The evolution must be thus described by the so-called positive map. The following definition takes into account the possibility that the output state of a given process might not be defined on the same Hilbert space.

Definition 2.4. The space of positive maps between $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_2)$, denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$, is defined as the set of linear mappings $\Lambda : \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_1) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ such that for $A \geq 0$ we have $\Lambda(A) \geq 0$. We will use the notation $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$.

Another invariant during the hypothetical evolution must be the trace ρ. Nevertheless, positivity and trace-preservation are just necessary but not a sufficient conditions requested from a map representing quantum evolution. The system in question can be always treated as a part of a composite system described by the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{env}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{env}$ describe some

environment. Under the evolution the state of a compound system, initially equal $\rho' = \rho \otimes \rho_{env}$, must also evolve keeping the positive semi-definiteness intact, even if 'nothing happens' to the environment itself. It means that the map $\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_{env}}$ (representing lack of actual evolution of the environment) must also be a positive map acting on density states of the system plus the environment. A map Λ fulfilling this condition for all auxiliary Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{env}$ is called a completely positive map (in short CP map). We denote the set of completely positive maps between $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ by $\mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$.

Definition 2.5. A positive map $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ is called completely positive if and only if it satisfies $\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{I}_p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}^p, \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^p)$ for all natural p.

A CP map which is trace preserving is called a quantum channel. The set of all quantum channels $\Lambda : \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$, which we denote by $\mathcal{CP}_0(\mathcal{H})$ can be viewed as a set consisting of all possible evolutions that states from ρ can undergo[2]. Latter on in the thesis we will need some basic properties of CP maps which we state here for completeness. The criterion for being a CP map is given by the Jamiołkowski-Choi mapping.

Fact 2.1. *(Jamiołkowski-Choi [49]) There is one to one correspondence between completely positive maps on N dimensional complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and non-negative positive operators on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. The isomorphism is given by the Jamiołkowski-Choi mapping $J : \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathrm{Herm}_+(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$,*

$$J(\Lambda) = (\mathbb{I} \otimes \Lambda)(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|), \tag{2.4}$$

where $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}$, $\Lambda \in \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$ and $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{i=N} |i\rangle|i\rangle$ for some fixed orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$ of $\mathcal{H}$.

Checking the complete positivity can be thus reduced to determining whether the corresponding operator $J(\Lambda)$ acting on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ is positive semi-definite. To this end we need the inverse of the Jamiołkowski-Choi mapping $J^{-1} : \mathrm{Herm}_+(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$. It is given by the following formula,

$$\left(J^{-1}(A)\right)(\rho) = \mathrm{tr}_1\left[\left(\rho^T \otimes \mathbb{I}\right) A\right], \tag{2.5}$$

where $A \in \mathrm{Herm}_+(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$, $\rho \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathrm{tr}_1 : \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ is the partial trace over the first factor of $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$, and ρ^T is a transpose of the operator ρ in the basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$. We will also use the so-called Kraus decomposition (see [49]) of CP maps.

Fact 2.2. *For each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$ there exist a set of operators $T_\alpha : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ ($\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is the set of indices) such that for all $\rho \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} T_\alpha \rho T_\alpha^\dagger. \tag{2.6}$$

The map Λ expressed in the form of Kraus decomposition (2.6) is manifestly CP. Operators T_α appearing in (2.6) are called Kraus operators. Decomposition (2.6) is by no means unique. Note however, that in the special case of the unitary evolution (which is, of course a CP map) $\Lambda(\rho) = U\rho U^\dagger$ it is enough to consider just one Kraus operator $T_\alpha = U$.

Not all operations important in quantum mechanics are represented by linear operators. An important example is a class of antiunitary operators.

[2] It is important to mention that a restriction of a channel $\Lambda \in \mathcal{CP}_0(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ to a subsystem $\mathcal{H}_A$ in general does not lead to a completely positive map, provided the initial sate of a total system is not separable [49].

Definition 2.6. A mapping $\theta : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is called antiunitary if and only if for all $|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$

$$\theta\left(a|\psi\rangle + b|\phi\rangle\right) = a^*\theta|\psi\rangle + b^*\theta|\phi\rangle$$

and

$$\langle\theta\psi|\theta\phi\rangle = \langle\psi|\phi\rangle^* . \tag{2.7}$$

Antiunitary operators are important as they describe symmetries of quantum systems such as the operation of time reversal [51]. The structure of antiunitary operators was given by Wigner [52]. He showed that every antiunitary operator θ has the form $\theta = UK$, where U is an unitary operator and K is a complex conjugation is some fixed orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$ of $\mathcal{H}$,

$$K\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i|i\rangle\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i^*|i\rangle . \tag{2.8}$$

The class of antiunitary operators will be extensively used in Chapter 4 as they allow, in certain cases, to describe analytically classes of mixed correlated states (in a sense used throughout this thesis, see Section 1.1).

2.2. Methods of entanglement theory

As it was indicated in Chapter 1, this thesis focuses mostly on the generalized separability problem, i.e. a problem to characterize the set of separable (or equivalently entangled) states. Many of the tools used in the context of the separability problem can be also applied to its generalization. In this section we present a quick survey of basic facts from the theory of entanglement detection, focusing on the bipartite and finite dimensional case. See [5] for the review of methods used to detect entanglement.

Let us start with the formal definition of bipartite separable states. A set of separable bipartite states $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$ is defined as a convex hull of pure product states $\mathcal{M}_d \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$.

$$.\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M}_d^c = \left\{ \sum_i p_i|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \;\middle|\; \sum_i p_i = 1,\, p_i \geq 0\,,\, |\psi_i\rangle = |\phi_i^A\rangle|\phi_i^B\rangle \right\} . \tag{2.9}$$

Due to the importance of the concept of entanglement (see Subsection 1.1.1) one would like to have a universal method to detect whether arbitrary state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$ is separable or not. Entanglement detection have been proven to be very hard from the perspective of the theory of computational complexity. Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the trace norm on Herm $\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$.

Problem. (WMSP (ϵ), Weak membership problem for separability) Given a density matrix $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$ with the premise that either (i) $\rho \in \mathcal{S}$ or (ii) $\min_{\sigma\in\mathcal{S}} \|\rho - \sigma\| \geq \epsilon$, decide which is the case.

In [53] it was proven that the above problem is NP-hard for $\epsilon = \exp\left(-O\left(d\right)\right)$, where $d = \sqrt{d_1 d_2}$. This result was later improved in [54] where the NP-hardness was proven for $\epsilon = O\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(d)}\right)$, where poly (d) denotes some polynomial of finite degree in d. The intuitive meaning of NP-hardness of WMSP (ϵ) is that every problem from the class of NP can be reduced to WMSP (ϵ) in the polynomial time [55]. This in turn strongly suggest the hardness of WMSP (ϵ) since for many problems belonging to the class NP there are no known effective (polynomial time) algorithms that solve them (a well known example is the traveling salesman problem).

Entanglement witnesses and positive maps

For the reason presented above one suspects that in general separability problem is "hard". Therefore it is natural to relax our expectations and focus only on partial characterization of the set of separable/entangled states. The basic tool for detecting entanglement are entanglement witnesses [56, 57].

Definition. A Hermitian operator $W \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$ is called entanglement witness if and only if

1. $\mathrm{tr}\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\mathrm{W}\right) \geq 0$ for all pure separable states $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_d$.
2. $\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho\mathrm{W}\right) < 0$ for some entangled state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$.

The set of entanglement witnesses will be denoted by $\mathcal{W}$.

From the definition of the entanglement witness it follows that $\mathrm{tr}\left(\sigma\mathrm{W}\right) \geq 0$ for all separable states $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}$. Consequently, if for a given mixed state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$ we can find an entanglement witness $\tilde{W} \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho\tilde{\mathrm{W}}\right) < 0$, then we can infer that ρ is entangled. In such a situation we say that the entanglement witness $\tilde{W}$ detects the state ρ. The following fact shows that with the help of entanglement witnesses we can describe the whole set of separable states $\mathcal{S}$.

Fact 2.3. *([56]) Every entangled state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$ is detected by some entanglement witness $W \in \mathcal{W}$.*

The proof of the above relies on the fact that the set of separable state $\mathcal{S}$, understood as a subset of $\mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$ is closed (in the standard trace norm on $\mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$) and convex. Therefore, for an operator $X \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$, outside $\mathcal{S}$, there exist a hyperplane separating this point from $\mathcal{S}$. Let us note that the analogous result holds for every convex and closed subset $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ of $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. For this reason one can introduce the "generalized correlation witnesses" for the scenarios introduced in Chapter 1 (provided the set of non-correlated states $\mathcal{M}$ is closed). The result analogous to Fact 2.3 holds also in this generalized setting. The similar considerations can be repeated in the infinite-dimensional setting but the proof requires Hahn-Banach separation theorem [58].

An elegant characterization of entanglement witnesses can obtained via applying the following theorem[3].

Fact 2.4. *(Characterization of entanglement via positive maps [56]) Let $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$. The state ρ is separable if and only if for any natural d and for any positive map $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1}, \mathbb{C}^{d}\right)$ an operator $\left(\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{I}_{d_2}\right)(\rho)$ is positive. In fact it suffices to check the positivity of $\left(\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{I}_{d_2}\right)(\rho)$ for $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1}, \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$.*

Since $\left(\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{I}_{d_2}\right)(\rho)$ is automatically positive if Λ is completely positive, the result given in Fact 2.4 motivates an interest in positive but not completely positive maps. Bellow we discuss two examples of maps that are positive but not completely positive: the transposition map and the reduction map. They give rise to important criteria for detection of entanglement.

[3] In Section 2.1 we introduced the isomorphism between $\mathcal{CP}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$ and $\mathrm{Herm}_{+}\left(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}\right)$. In fact formulas (2.4) and (2.5) can be used to define isomorphism $\mathcal{J} : \mathrm{End}\left(\mathrm{End}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)\right) \to \mathrm{End}\left(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}\right)$. Analogous formulas can be used to get the isomorphism (also called Jamiołkowski-Choi isomorphism)

$$\tilde{J} : \mathrm{End}\left(\mathrm{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_1\right), \mathrm{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_2\right)\right) \to \mathrm{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2\right) .$$

The transposition map $T : \mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \to \mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ is defined by first specifying the basis (not necessarily orthonormal) $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d}$ of $\mathbb{C}^d$. The action of T is first defined on rank one operators

$$T\left(|i\rangle\langle j|\right) = |j\rangle\langle i|$$

and than extended by linearity to the whole $\mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. In other words, if we identify $X \in \mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ with its representation in some basis, the transposition map maps X to its transposition. It is a known fact [56, 59] that $T \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ but $T \notin \mathcal{CP}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. Therefore, by the virtue of Fact 2.4, the transposition map can be used to formulate the criterion for entanglement. This criterion, called a positive partial transposition (PPT) or Peres-Horodecki criterion, takes the following form

$$\rho \in \mathcal{S} \implies \left(T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{d_2}\right)(\rho) \geq 0\,. \tag{2.10}$$

If we expand a bipartite state ρ in a natural basis of a tensor product $\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$,

$$\rho = \sum_{i,j,k,l} \rho_{j,l}^{i,k} |i\rangle\langle j| \otimes |k\rangle\langle l|$$

we see that

$$\left(T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{d_2}\right)(\rho) = \sum_{i,j,k,l} \rho_{j,l}^{i,k} |j\rangle\langle k| \otimes |k\rangle\langle l| = \sum_{i,j,k,l} \left[\rho^{T_1}\right]_{i,l}^{j,k} |i\rangle\langle j| \otimes |k\rangle\langle l|,$$

where $\left[\rho^{T_1}\right]_{i,l}^{j,k} = \rho_{i,l}^{j,k}$. This motivates the name of the criterion. By the virtue of (2.10), if a given state does not have a positive partial transposition then it is automatically entangled. The importance of PPT criterion comes from the fact that for low dimensional single particle Hilbert spaces the PPT criterion gives the complete characterization of separability.

Fact 2.5. *([56]) Let $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right)$ and let $d_1 \cdot d_2 \leq 6$. Then the following equivalence holds*

$$\rho \in \mathcal{S} \iff \left(T \otimes \mathbb{I}_{d_2}\right)(\rho) \geq 0\,.$$

For systems with higher dimensions the PPT criterion is not strong enough to solve a separability problem. In particular for $d_1 \cdot d_2 > 6$ there exist mixed states that posses positive partial transposition despite being entangled. Such states are called PPT entangled states[4].

Another example of a map which is positive but not completely positive is a reduction map [60] $\mathcal{R} : \mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \to \mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. It is defined by the following expression

$$\mathcal{R}(X) = \mathrm{Tr}(X)\,\mathbb{I}_d - X\,. \tag{2.11}$$

From Fact 2.4 we infer the following criterion for entanglement

$$\rho \in \mathcal{S} \implies \mathbb{I}_{d_1} \otimes \rho_2 - \rho \geq 0\,, \tag{2.12}$$

where $\rho_2 = \mathrm{tr}_1(\rho)$. The reduction map is positive but not completely positive. Moreover in [60] it was proven that $\mathcal{R}$ is decomposable, i.e.

$$\mathcal{R} = \Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2 \circ T \tag{2.13}$$

where $\Lambda_{1,2} \in \mathcal{CP}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ and T is a transposition map defined above. From Eq.(2.13) it easily follows that $\mathcal{R}$ cannot detect PPT entangled sates.

[4] The states which are PPT entangled for an important class of states. In particular they exhibit so-called bound entanglement [3]. However, we will not study this class of states in this thesis.

Other criteria for detection of entanglement

In this part we discuss briefly a number of criteria for entanglement which are not given by an entanglement witness or a positive map.

The first example is the criterion for entanglement based on Renyi entropy [61]. Quantum Renyi entropy of order $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ is given by[5]

$$S_\alpha = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln \left(\mathrm{tr} \left(\rho^\alpha \right) \right) .$$

The criterion takes the following form

$$\rho \in \mathcal{S} \implies S_\alpha \left(\rho_2 \right) \leq S_\alpha \left(\rho \right) , \, \alpha \in (0, \infty) . \tag{2.14}$$

The violation of the inequality $S_\alpha \left(\rho_2 \right) \leq S_\alpha \left(\rho \right)$ for some α is therefore an indicator that a state ρ is entangled. The criterion (2.14) was proven in [61]. It was showed that the inequality $S_\alpha \left(\rho_2 \right) \leq S_\alpha \left(\rho \right)$ follows from the inequality $\mathbb{I}_{d_1} \otimes \rho_2 - \rho \geq 0$. Consequently, PPT entangled states cannot violate the inequality $S_\alpha \left(\rho_2 \right) \leq S_\alpha \left(\rho \right)$.

We now discuss the method of entanglement detection based on so-called convex roof extension. We decide to describe this concept in the general setting as we will make use of it in Chapter 8.2 of this thesis. Let V be a real, finite-dimensional vector space. Let $\mathcal{E} \subset V$ be a compact subset of W and let $\mathcal{E}^c$ be its convex hull (due to compactness of $\mathcal{M}$ it is also compact). Let $f : \mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. We define its convex roof extension [62], denoted by $f^\cup$, by

$$f^\cup \left(x \right) = \inf_{\sum_k p_k x_k = x} \sum_k p_k f \left(x_k \right) , \tag{2.15}$$

where the infimum is taken over all possible convex decompositions of x onto vectors from the set of extremal points $\mathcal{E}$. Let $\mathcal{E}_0 \subset \mathcal{E}$ be some compact subset of the set of extremal points and let $\mathcal{E}_0^c \subset \mathcal{C}$ be its convex hull. If $f|_{\mathcal{E}_0} = c$ and $f|_{\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}_0} > c$, then $f^\cup \left(x \right) = c$ if and only if $x \in \mathcal{E}_0^c$. Therefore $f^\cup$ can serve as an identifier of the set $\mathcal{E}_0^c$. In the context of separability problem $\mathcal{D} \left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \right)$ correspond to $\mathcal{E}^c$ whereas pure states $\mathcal{D}_1 \left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \right)$ correspond to $\mathcal{E}$. Separable pure states $\mathcal{M}_d$ play the role of $\mathcal{E}_0$ and therefore the set of separable states $\mathcal{S}$ can be identified with $\mathcal{E}_0^c$. Assume now that we have a function $g : \mathcal{D}_1 \left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2} \right) \to \mathbb{R}$ that $g \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \right) \geq 0$ and $g \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \right) = 0$ if and only if $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}$. Then the convex roof extension $g^\cup$ can be used as an indicator of entanglement. Functions satisfying the desired properties are known. An example is entanglement of formation [63] E_f given by[6]

$$E_F \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \right) = H \left(\mathrm{tr}_1 \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \right) \right) . \tag{2.16}$$

To sum up, the problem of characterization of $\mathcal{S}$ is equivalent to computation of a convex roof

$$g^\cup \left(\rho \right) = \inf_{\sum_k p_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k| = \rho} \sum_k p_k g \left(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k| \right) \tag{2.17}$$

for the suitably chosen function g. Unfortunately the explicit computation of $g^\cup$ is possible only for special functions in low dimensional cases (see [62] for a review of the concept of convex roof extensions). The physically relevant examples of such situations include entanglement of

[5] For $\alpha \to 1$ quantum Renyi entropy converges to von-Neumann entropy $H \left(\rho \right)$.

[6] In Chapter 3 we give a number of such functions for the problem of entanglement and its generalizations.

formation and concurrence for two qbits. The concurrence [64] $C : \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2\right) \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by the following formula:

$$C\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right) = |\langle\psi|\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y|\psi^*\rangle| \ ,$$

where $\sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $|\psi^*\rangle$is the complex conjugate of a vector $|\psi\rangle$ written in a standard basis of $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, $\{|0\rangle|0\rangle, |0\rangle|1\rangle, |1\rangle|0\rangle, |1\rangle|1\rangle\}$. The convex roof extension of C (we dropped the superscript for simplicity) is given [64] by the formula[7]

$$C\left(\rho\right) = \max\left\{0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4\right\} \ , \tag{2.18}$$

where λ_i are eigenvalues of the Hermitian operator $R = \sqrt{\rho\tilde{\rho}}$, where

$$\tilde{\rho} = \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \rho^* \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \, ,$$

and ρ^* denotes the complex conjugation of the matrix ρ written in the standard basis of $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$.

Since the problem of computing of the convex roof is difficult one can also hope to gain some information about entanglement by deriving lower bounds of the convex roof extensions of the relevant functions. This approach was initiated in [65] and where authors derived efficiently computable lower bounds for the convex roof of the bipartite concurrence. It was latter developed further in [66, 67, 68]. For the extension to the scenario of generalized entanglement (c.f. Section 1.1) see [69].

Let us finish our considerations with the brief explanation of the method of *symmetric extensions* [70]. Let us label the Hilbert spaces associated to subsystems of the bipartite system by $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ respectively. The idea of the method of symmetric extensions comes from the following observation. If a state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\right)$ is separable then it admits a symmetric extension to $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_B^{(1)} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_B^{(k)}\right)$ for any natural k. In other words for each k there exist a state $\rho^{(n)} \in \mathcal{D}\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_B^{(1)} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_B^{(k)}\right)$ such that

1. The state $\rho^{(k)}$ is symmetric under exchange of subsystems $B_1, \ldots, B_k$.
2. $\mathrm{tr}_{B_2,\ldots,B_k}\left(\rho^{(k)}\right) = \rho$.

In [70] it was proven that checking whether a state ρ posses a symmetric extension to $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_B^{(1)} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_B^{(k)}\right)$ can be directly formulated as a semidefinite programme. Semidefinite programs are optimization problems that can not only be solved efficiently, but under weak conditions the global optimality of the found solution, can also be proven to be optimal. Consequently, the problem of finding $\rho^{(k)}$ can be directly tackled with standard numerical packages, and if no extension is found, the algorithm can also prove that no extension exists, consequently the state must be entangled. Due to the symmetry requirements, the number of parameters in the semidefinite program increases only polynomially in the number of extensions. The method of symmetric extensions delivers a hierarchy of separability criteria, as the existence of symmetric extension to $k+1$ parties automatically ensure the existence of the symmetric extension to k parties. Authors of [70] used the quantum de-Finetti theorem to show that the hierarchy is complete: any entangled state is detected in some step of the hierarchy. The method from [70] has been latter on developed in a series of papers [71, 72, 73, 74].

[7] The convex roof extension of E_F can be computed explicitly from Eq.(2.18) (see [64] for details).

2.3. Differential geometry, Lie groups and Lie algebras

Lie groups and Lie algebras have been accompanying quantum mechanics ever since the beginning of this theory, starting from the pioneering work of Wigner [51]. The role of these objects is prominent as, just like in the classical setting, they describe symmetries and conservation laws in quantum systems. Although Lie groups and Lie algebras appear naturally in quantum mechanics, the proper language of this theory seems to be that of functional analysis and linear algebra. It turns out however, that many concepts and structures appearing in quantum theory have a natural geometrical interpretation. Application of methods of differential geometry and topology in quantum mechanics has led not only to its elegant formulation but also enabled the discovery of many important physical phenomena (among others: celebrated Aharonov-Bohm effect, Berry phase and the existence of anyons [75]). The aim of this part is to give basic definitions and facts form differential geometry and the theory of Lie groups and algebras that will be applied in other parts of the thesis. In the course of the presentation of general structures we will also give examples of concrete objects that will be used latter. For a survey of application of geometric and topological methods in quantum mechanics see excellent textbooks [76] and [77]. For a neat introduction to the theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras see [78]. The modern account to application of the theory of Lie groups in physics can be found in [79, 80].

2.3.1. Differential geometry

In this section we outline concepts and facts from differential geometry that will be used in other parts of the thesis. We do not give any proofs nor reasoning leading to the presented results. Interested reader is welcomed to consult the relevant specialized literature [77, 81].

Basic definitions and examples

Definition 2.7. A differential manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is a topological space which is provided with the family of pairs $\{(U_\alpha, \phi_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$, where

- Family $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ is the open covering of $\mathcal{N}$: each $U_\alpha \subset \mathcal{M}$ is open and $\cup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} U_\alpha = \mathcal{M}$;
- Mappings $\phi_\alpha : U_\alpha \to \mathbb{R}^N$ are homeomorphisms onto open subsets $\phi_\alpha(U_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$;
- Mappings from the family $\{\phi_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ satisfy compatibility conditions: whenever $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \neq \emptyset$, a function
$$\phi_\alpha \circ \phi_\beta^{-1}\big|_{\phi_\beta(U_\alpha\cap U_\beta)} : \phi_\beta(U_\alpha \cap U_\beta) \to \phi_\alpha(U_\alpha \cap U_\beta) ,$$

is infinitely differentiable.

Intuitively speaking above conditions mean that $\mathcal{M}$ "locally looks" like the open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ (the number N is called the dimension of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$). A pair (U_α, ϕ_α) is called a chart.

Let us list basic examples of differential manifolds. Some of them will be used in latter chapters of the thesis.

- **Real coordinate space** $\mathbb{R}^k$. The space $\mathbb{R}^k$ is a manifold of dimension $N = k$.
- **Unit sphere** $\mathbb{S}_k$ in $k+1$ dimensions. The sphere $\mathbb{S}_k$ is a manifold of dimension $N = k$. It is defined by
$$\mathbb{S}_k = \left\{ (x_1, \ldots, x_{k+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1} | \sum_{i=1}^{i=k} x_i^2 = 1 \right\} .$$

- **Set of isospectral density matrices** in finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ of dimension D. The set of isospectral density matrices is defined by

$$\Omega_{\{p_1,\ldots,p_D\}} = \{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \,|\mathrm{Sp}(\rho) = (p_1,\ldots,p_D)\},$$

where $\mathrm{Sp}(\rho)$ denotes the ordered spectrum of ρ, i.e. $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \ldots \geq p_D \geq 0$. For $\mathrm{sp}(\rho) = (1,0,\ldots,0)$ we $\Omega_{\{p_1,\ldots,p_D\}} = \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$. This family of manifolds will be extensively used throughout the thesis (see Chapters 3-6). The manifold $\Omega_{\{p_1,\ldots,p_D\}}$ will be discussed in Subsection 2.3.3 in the context of the action of a Lie group $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ on the set of density matrices $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$.

Smooth maps, tangent and cotangent spaces

Definition 2.8. A function f on $\mathcal{M}$ is called a smooth map from $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ if and only if for all coordinate functions ϕ_α a function $f \circ \phi_\alpha^{-1}$ is a smooth real-valued function on $\phi_\alpha(U_\alpha)$. The set of smooth functions on $\mathcal{M}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$.

It is also important to introduce smooth mappings (functions) between differential manifolds. Definition of smooth mapping between two manifolds $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ is analogous to the definition of a smooth functions on $\mathcal{M}$.

Definition 2.9. Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ be manifolds having atlases $\{(U_\alpha,\phi_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$ and $\{(V_\beta,\psi_\beta)\}_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}}$. Assume that $\dim\mathcal{M} = N_1$ and $\dim\mathcal{N} = N_2$. A mapping $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$ is called smooth if and only if mappings $\psi_\beta \circ f \circ \phi_\alpha^{-1} : \phi_\alpha(U_\alpha) \to \psi_\beta(V_\beta)$ are smooth (as mappings between open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{N_1}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{N_2}$ respectively) whenever $f(U_\alpha) \cap V_\beta \neq \emptyset$. The set of smooth functions between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})$.

A special class of smooth functions consists of curves on $\mathcal{M}$ i.e smooth mappings $\gamma : U \to \mathcal{M}$, where U is the open subset of $\mathbb{R}$. Definition of smooth functions on the differentiable manifold is indispensable for introducing concepts of a tangent space and a cotangent space.

Definition 2.10. A tangent space to a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ at the point $p \in \mathcal{M}$, denoted by $T_p\mathcal{M}$, is a vector space consisting of linear mappings $V : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the Leibniz property: $V(f\cdot g) = f(p)X(g) + V(f)\,g(p)$, where $f,\, g \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$.

The space $T_p\mathcal{M}$ is a real vector space of finite dimension equal to N, the dimension of the manifold itself. Every element $V \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ can be expressed uniquely as a linear combination of basis vectors[8]

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^{N} V^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}, \tag{2.19}$$

[8] Each coordinate system $\phi_\alpha = \left(x^1(\cdot),\ldots,x^N(\cdot)\right)$ covering the neighborhood of p gives rise to the basis of $T_p\mathcal{M}$. Let $\left(x^1(p),\ldots,x^N(p)\right)$ denote the coordinates of the point p. The basis of $T_p\mathcal{M}$ is given by the set of operators of "partial derivative", $\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\big|_p\right\}_{i=1}^N$, defined by

$$\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\big|_p(f) = \left.\frac{\partial\left(f\circ\phi_\alpha^{-1}\right)}{\partial x^i}\right|_{(x^1,\ldots,x^N)=(x^1(p),\ldots,x^N(p))},$$

where $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$ and $f\circ\phi_\alpha^{-1}$ on the right hand side of the above expression is treated as a usual smooth function on $U_\alpha \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. In what follows, unless it causes a confusion, we will drop the subscript p in $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}\big|_p$.

Let us remark that on the intuitive level tangent vectors can be interpreted as generalized directional derivatives of smooth function computed at the point $p \in \mathcal{M}$.

We now define the cotangent space, the vector space dual to a tangent space.

Definition 2.11. A cotangent space to a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ at the point $p \in \mathcal{M}$, $T_p^*\mathcal{M}$ is defined as a vector space dual to $T_p\mathcal{M}$, i.e. $T_p^*\mathcal{M} = (T_p\mathcal{M})^*$.

Just like the tangent space, the cotangent space $T_p^*\mathcal{M}$ is a real vector space of finite dimension N. In the coordinate system $\phi_\alpha = \left(x^1(\cdot), \ldots, x^N(\cdot)\right)$ defined in the neighborhood of $p \in \mathcal{M}$ the basis of $T_p^*\mathcal{M}$ is given by $\left\{ dx^i|_p \right\}_{i=1}^N$, defined by conditions

$$\left\langle dx^i\big|_p \,,\, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\bigg|_p \right\rangle = \delta_{ij} \,,$$

where $\langle \omega,\, V \rangle$ denotes the pairing of $\omega \in T_p^*\mathcal{M}$ with $V \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ and δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker delta. An alternative interpretation of vectors $dx^i|_p$ comes from the fact that in the coordinate system ϕ_α they can be identified with the usual derivatives of functions $x^i(\cdot)$ computed at $\left(x^1, \ldots, x^N\right) = \left(x^1(p), \ldots, x^N(p)\right)$. In what follows, unless it leads a confusion, we will drop the subscript p in $dx^i|_p$. Every element $\omega \in T_p^*\mathcal{M}$ can be expressed uniquely as a linear combination of basis vectors,

$$\omega = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_i dx^i \,. \tag{2.20}$$

Let us remind that due to the paring $T_p^*\mathcal{M} \times T_p\mathcal{M} \ni (\omega,\, V) \to \langle \omega,\, V \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$, we can interpret $T_p\mathcal{M}$ as a space dual to $T_p^*\mathcal{M}$, $T_p\mathcal{M} \approx \left(T_p^*\mathcal{M}\right)^*$.

Assume now that we have a smooth mapping between two manifolds $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$. For every $p \in \mathcal{M}$ we have the induced linear mapping $f^* : T_p\mathcal{M} \to T_{f(p)}\mathcal{N}$ defined by,

$$f^*V\,(F) = V\,(F \circ f) \,,$$

for $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{N})$ and $V \in T_p\mathcal{M}$. Analogously, we have a linear map being a transpose of f^*, $f_* : T_{f(p)}^*\mathcal{N} \to T_p^*\mathcal{M}$. It is defined via the condition

$$\langle f_*\omega,\, V \rangle = \langle \omega,\, f^*V \rangle \,,$$

for $\omega \in T_{f(p)}^*\mathcal{N}$ and $V \in T_p\mathcal{M}$. Let and $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$ and $g : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{K}$ be smooth mappings between differential manifolds. The following identities hold:

$$(g \circ f)^* = g^* \circ f^*,\, (g \circ f)_* = f_* \circ g_* \,,$$

where the domains of the involved mappings are implicit.

Vector fields and one-forms

Definition 2.12. A tangent bundle to the manifold $\mathcal{M}$, $T\mathcal{M}$, is defined by

$$T\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \{(p,\, v) \,|\, v \in T_p\mathcal{M}\} \,.$$

On $T\mathcal{M}$ we have a natural projection $\pi : T\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ given by $\pi([p,\, v]) = p$. A tangent bundle $T\mathcal{M}$ can be equipped with a differential structure that makes from it a $2N$ dimensional manifold and for which the projection $\pi : T\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ is a smooth mapping.

The concept of a tangent bundle can be used to define, among other things, vector fields on a manifold $\mathcal{M}$.

Definition 2.13. A vector field X on a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is a smooth mapping $X : \mathcal{M} \to T\mathcal{M}$ which satisfies the condition $\pi(X(p)) = p$ for each $p \in \mathcal{M}$. The collection of all vector fields on $\mathcal{M}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$.

Informally one can think of a vector field X as a smooth mapping that assigns to any point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ exactly one vector X_p in the corresponding tangent space $T_p\mathcal{M}$. In what follows we will identify, for the sake of simplicity, a vector $X_p \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ with the element of the associated element of the tangent bundle $X(p) = (p, X_p)$. The set of vector fields $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$ posses a natural structure of a vector space over real numbers. Moreover, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$ the object $f \cdot X$, defined by $(f \cdot X)(g) = fX(g)$ (for $g \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$), is again a vector field[9] The set of vector fields $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$ is equipped with the *Lie bracket* of vector fields, $[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M}) \times \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$, defined by,

$$[X, Y](f) = X(Y(f)) - Y(X(f)) ,$$

for $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$, $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$. Lie bracket is bilinear, antisymmetric and satisfies the Jacobi identity (2.28).

Definition 2.14. A cotangent bundle to the manifold $\mathcal{M}$, $T^*\mathcal{M}$, is defined by

$$T^*\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ (p, \omega) \,|\, \omega \in T_p^*\mathcal{M} \right\} .$$

Just like in the case of tangent bundle on cotangent bundle we have the projection $\pi : T^*\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ given by $\pi([p, \omega]) = p$ (in order not to complicate the notation we will consequently use the same symbol for projections defined on $T\mathcal{M}$ and $T^*\mathcal{M}$ respectively). Analogously, cotangent bundle $T^*\mathcal{M}$ can be given a differential structure that makes from it a $2N$ dimensional manifold and for which the projection $\pi : T^*\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ is a smooth mapping.

Analogously to the concept of vector fields differential one-forms are defined as sections of the cotangent bundle.

Definition 2.15. A one-form ω on a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is a smooth mapping $\omega : \mathcal{M} \to T^*\mathcal{M}$ which satisfies the condition $\pi(\omega(p)) = p$ for each $p \in \mathcal{M}$. The collection of all 1-forms on $\mathcal{M}$ is denoted by $\Omega_1(\mathcal{M})$.

From the informal perspective the one-form ω is a smooth mapping that assigns to any point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ exactly one covector ω_p in the corresponding cotangent space $T_p^*\mathcal{M}$. In what follows we identify, for the sake of simplicity, a covector $\omega_p \in T_p^*\mathcal{M}$ with the associated element of the cotangent bundle $\omega(p) = (p, \omega_p)$. Every smooth function $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$ defines, in a natural manner, one-form $dF \in \Omega_1(\mathcal{M})$, given by

$$\langle dF_p, V \rangle = V(F) , \tag{2.21}$$

for $V \in T_p\mathcal{M}$. One form dF can be also interpreted as a derivative of the function F.

[9] Actually, this action of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$ on gives $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{M})$ the structure of a ring over $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$.

General tensor fields

Notions of the tangent vectors and covectors can be extended to tensors of arbitrary type. By taking multiple tensor powers of $T_p\mathcal{M}$ and $T_p^*\mathcal{M}$ to each point of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ we attach a vector space $T_p^{(m,n)}\mathcal{M}$ consisting of tensors of the type $(n,\, m)$,

$$T^m_{n,\,p}\mathcal{M} = (T_p\mathcal{M})^{\otimes m} \otimes \left(T_p^*\mathcal{M}\right)^{\otimes n} . \tag{2.22}$$

Any element $\mathrm{T} \in T^m_{n,\,p}\mathcal{M}$ can be interpreted as a multilinear form on m copies of $T_p^*\mathcal{M}$ and n copies of $T_p\mathcal{M}$,

$$\mathrm{T} : \left(T_p^*\mathcal{M}\right)^{\times m} \times (T_p\mathcal{M})^{\times n} \to \mathbb{R} .$$

Using the notation from (2.19) and (2.20) we express $\mathrm{T} \in T^m_{n,\,p}\mathcal{M}$ in the following manner

$$\mathrm{T} = \sum_{i_1=1}^{N} \ldots \sum_{i_m=1}^{N} \sum_{j_1=1}^{N} \ldots \sum_{j_n=1}^{N} \mathrm{T}^{i_1 \ldots i_m}_{j_1 \ldots j_n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_1}} \otimes \ldots \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_m}} \otimes dx^{j_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes dx^{j_n} , \tag{2.23}$$

where vectors of the form $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_1}} \otimes \ldots \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{i_m}} \otimes dx^{j_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes dx^{j_n}$ form the basis of $(T_p\mathcal{M})^{\otimes m} \otimes \left(T_p^*\mathcal{M}\right)^{\otimes n}$. Analogously to cases of the tangent and the cotangent bundle it is possible to define a general tensor bundle $\mathcal{T}^m_{n,\,p}\mathcal{M}$ which is a N^{m+n+1} manifold. As before, we have a natural projection $\pi : \mathcal{T}^m_{n,\,p}\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ which is a smooth mapping. We will be particularly interested in sections of the bundle $\mathcal{T}^m_{n,\,p}\mathcal{M}$ (tensor fields of the type $(m,\, n)$ on $\mathcal{M}$). The reason for that comes from the fact that many interesting geometrical structures on the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ can be interpreted as tensor fields on $\mathcal{M}$.

Definition 2.16. A tensor field of the type $(m,\, n)$ on a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is a smooth mapping $\mathrm{T} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{T}^m_{n,\,p}\mathcal{M}$ which satisfies the condition $\pi\left(\mathrm{T}\left(p\right)\right) = p$ for each $p \in \mathcal{M}$. The collection of all tensor fields of the type $(m,\, n)$ is denoted by $\mathcal{T}^m_n(\mathcal{M})$.

2.3.2. Elements of Riemannian geometry

The Riemannian structure is a way to introduce the natural distance on a manifold. It also allows to transfer to the realm of manifolds many concepts known from the euclidean geometry (such as the parallel transport or the volume form). We will touch the subject of Riemannian geometry only superficially, limiting ourselves only to listing the structures that will be used in the thesis.

Definition 2.17. A Riemannian metric g on a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is a tensor field of type $(0,\, 2)$, $g \in \mathcal{T}^0_2\left(\mathcal{M}\right)$, such that for every $p \in \mathcal{M}$ the linear map $g_p : (T_p\mathcal{M})^{\otimes 2} \to \mathbb{R}$ is positive definite and symmetric:

$$g_p\left(V,\, W\right) = g_p\left(W,\, V\right) \text{ for each } V, W \in T_p\mathcal{M} ,$$

$$g_p\left(V,\, V\right) \geq 0 \text{ and } g_p\left(V, V\right) = 0 \text{ if and only if } V = 0, \text{ for } V \in T_p\mathcal{M} .$$

Intuitively, a Riemannian metric g attach to each tangent space $T_p\mathcal{M}$ an euclidean inner product g_p. The length of $V \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ is defined via the expression $\sqrt{g_p\left(V,\, V\right)}$.

Given a smooth curve $\gamma : [0,\, 1] \to \mathcal{M}$ we can define its length by

$$L_\gamma = \int_{[0,\,1]} \sqrt{g\left(\frac{d\gamma}{dt},\, \frac{d\gamma}{dt}\right)}\, dt .$$

Given a connected manifold $\mathcal{M}$ one defines the distance between two points $p, q \in \mathcal{M}$ as the infimum over the curves γ that start at the point p and end at the point q,

$$\mathrm{d}\,(p,\,q) = \inf_{\gamma:\,\gamma(0)=p,\,\gamma(1)=q} L_\gamma\,.$$

Existence of a metric g allows to introduce a measure μ on $\mathcal{M}$. Let us first express the Riemann metric in coordinates $\left(x^1, \ldots, x^N\right)$ associated to some chart (U_α, ϕ_α). The metric g on U_α is specified by the matrix-valued function on $\phi_\alpha\,(U_\alpha)$: $g_{ij} = g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i},\,\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\right)$. On every chart (U_α, ϕ_α) the measure μ is defined by specifying the value of integrals on smooth functions f with the support[10] in U_α,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} f d\mu = \int_{\phi_\alpha(U_\alpha)} f\left(\phi_\alpha^{-1}\left(x^1, \ldots, x^N\right)\right)\sqrt{\det\left(g_{ij}\right)} dx^1 \ldots dx^N\,. \tag{2.24}$$

The integral on the right hand side of (2.24) is the usual Lebesgue integral[11] over the open subset $\phi_\alpha\,(U_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. it Integral for the general function $f \in \mathcal{F}\,(\mathcal{M})$ can by defined by "gluing together" integrals of the form (2.24) for different charts. If the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is compact then its measure is finite,

$$\mu\,(\mathcal{M}) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} d\mu = C < \infty\,.$$

When the metric tensor g is rescaled by some $\alpha > 0$, the measure μ changes accordingly,

$$g \to g' = \alpha \cdot g \implies \mu \to \mu' = \alpha^{\frac{N}{2}}\mu\,. \tag{2.25}$$

Consequently, by the appropriate rescaling of the metric g the measure μ on a compact manifold $\mathcal{M}$ can be chosen to be probabilistic i.e $\mu\,(\mathcal{M}) = 1$.

Having a metric g and a function $F \in \mathcal{F}\,(\mathcal{M})$, we define the gradient of F as the unique vector field $\nabla F \in \mathcal{X}\,(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying the equation

$$dF = g\,(\nabla F, \cdot)\ , \tag{2.26}$$

where the above expression is understood as the equality of two one-forms.

2.3.3. Lie groups and Lie algebras

Definitions and examples

Definition 2.18. A Lie group G is a group that has a structure of a differentiable manifold such that the group operations,

$$\cdot : G \times G \to G,\,(g_1,\,g_2) \to g_1 \cdot g_2\,,$$

$$(\cdot)^{-1} : G \to G,\,g \to g^{-1}\,,$$

[10] The support of the function f is defined by $\{p \in \mathcal{M} |\, f\,(p) \neq 0\}^{cl}$, where the superscript cl denotes the closure.

[11] The intuition behind this definition of a measure μ comes from the fact that applied to the "infinitesimal cube" it gives the right result, $\mu\left(\phi_\alpha^{-1}\left(\times_{i=1}^N \left[x_0^i,\,x_0^i + \Delta x^i\right]\right)\right) \approx \det\left(g_{ij}\right)\prod_{i=1}^N \Delta x^i$.

are smooth mappings.

Throughout the thesis we will adopt the multiplicative notation for the group law. By e we will denote the neutral element of the group. Usually, unless it causes a confusion, we will drop the multiplication symbol $\cdot$. Let us introduce left and right actions of a Lie group on itself. For any $g \in G$ its left and right action on elements of G are defined by,

$$\begin{aligned} &L_g : G \to G\,,\ x \to gx\,,\\ &R_g : G \to G\,,\ x \to xg\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

The above smooth mappings satisfy

$$L_{g_1} \circ L_{g_2} = L_{g_1 g_2},\ R_{g_1} \circ R_{g_2} = R_{g_2 g_1}\,, L_{g_1} \circ R_{g_2} = R_{g_2} \circ L_{g_1}\,,$$

For all $g_1,\ g_2 \in G$.

The basic example of a Lie group is a general linear group $GL\,(N,\,\mathbb{R})$. It is defined as a set of invertible real $N \times N$ matrices with the natural group law coming from matrix multiplication. Before proceeding to the definition of a Lie algebra of a Lie group let us present first the strictly algebraic definition of a Lie algebra.

Definition 2.19. A real finite-dimensional Lie algebra is a finite-dimensional vector space $\mathfrak{g}$ over $\mathbb{R}$ equipped with antisymmetric bilinear operation (called the *Lie bracket*) $[\cdot,\,\cdot]_{\mathfrak{g}} : \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}$ satisfying the *Jacobi identity,*

$$\Big[X,\,[Y,\,Z]_{\mathfrak{g}}\Big]_{\mathfrak{g}} + \Big[Z,\,[X,\,Y]_{\mathfrak{g}}\Big]_{\mathfrak{g}} + \Big[Y,\,[Z,\,X]_{\mathfrak{g}}\Big]_{\mathfrak{g}} = 0\,, \tag{2.28}$$

for all $X,\,Y,\,Z \in \mathfrak{g}$.

Lie algebras can be also defined over the field of complex numbers. Also, Lie algebras can be infinite-dimensional. The definitions are analogous to the one presented above. Although Lie algebras are interesting objects to study on their own, in this thesis we will be particularly interested in Lie algebras associated with Lie groups.

Definition 2.20. The Lie algebra of a Lie group G is a real vector space $\mathfrak{g}$ consisting of the left invariant vector fields on G, i.e. the vector fields satisfying $L_g^* X = X$ for all $g \in G$. The Lie bracket structure on $\mathfrak{g}$ is given by the commutator of vector fields,

$$[X\,,Y]_{\mathfrak{g}} = [X,\,Y] \ \ \text{(in a sense of vector fields on } G)\,,$$

for $X,\,Y \in \mathfrak{g}$.

Actually, every finite-dimensional real Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie algebra of some Lie group G [82]. For this reason in what follows, unless it causes a confusion, we will drop the subscript $\mathfrak{g}$ when referring to a Lie bracket of a Lie algebra. Because of the condition of the left invariance and the transitivity of the action of G on itself we have $X_g = L_g^* X_e$ for $X \in \mathfrak{g}$. As a result every $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ is uniquely specified by its value at the neutral element e. Thus, we have the linear isomorphism of real vector spaces $\mathfrak{g} \approx T_e G$. In what follows we will consequently use this identification. Throughout the thesis we will be using only matrix Lie groups which are Lie groups of particularly simple structure.

Definition 2.21. A matrix Lie group G is a closed[12] subgroup of the group $\mathrm{GL}\,(N,\,\mathbb{R})$ for some natural number N.

[12] With respect to the topology on $\mathrm{GL}\,(N,\,\mathbb{R})$ induced form the norm on $\mathrm{End}\,(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Because every closed subgroup of a Lie group automatically inherits the structure of a Lie group [79], the above definition makes sense. Every matrix Lie group G is an embedded[13] submanifold of $\mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ for some natural number N. Consequently, the tangent space T_eG can be treated as a subspace of $\mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$. For this reason Lie algebras of matrix Lie groups have a simple description as vector subspaces of $\mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$. In what follows $\exp : \mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right) \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathrm{N},\, \mathbb{R}\right)$ denotes the exponential of matrices.

Fact 2.6. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie algebra of the matrix Lie group $G \subset GL\left(N,\, \mathbb{R}\right)$. Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is described by the condition,*

$$X \in \mathfrak{g} \iff \exp\left(tX_e\right) \in G\,, \textit{for sufficiently small } t\,. \tag{2.29}$$

The value of the vector field $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ at $g \in G$ is given by $X_g = X_e g$, where the former expression should be understood is a sense of matrix multiplication.

Explicit computation of the Lie bracket of $X,\, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ gives

$$\left[X,\, Y\right]_e = \left[X_e,\, Y_e\right]_{\mathrm{Mat}}\,, \tag{2.30}$$

where $\left[X_e,\, Y_e\right]_{\mathrm{Mat}}$ is the usual commutator of operators, $\left[A,\, B\right]_{\mathrm{Mat}} = AB - BA$, for $A, B \in \mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$. In what follows we will be interested in values of $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ only at the neutral element of the group. For this reason, unless we state otherwise, we will identify $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ with $X_e \in T_eG \subset \mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$. Moreover, unless it causes a confusion, we will make no distinction between various types of Lie brackets. We will also use the convention $e = \mathbb{I}$, where $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity matrix of the appropriate dimension. Below we give examples of matrix Lie groups and the corresponding Lie algebras that will be used in the description of various classes of correlations in quantum systems. In each case considered below the Lie bracket structure is given by (2.30).

1. General linear group and special linear group The general linear group $GL(N,\, \mathbb{R})$ is defined as a group of invertible real $N \times N$ matrices,

$$\mathrm{GL}(N,\, \mathbb{R}) = \left\{g \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}\left(\mathbb{R}\right) \,|\, \det\left(g\right) \neq 0\right\}\,. \tag{2.31}$$

By the virtue of the Fact 2.6 its Lie algebra, $\mathfrak{gl}\left(N,\, \mathbb{R}\right)$ corresponds the space of all $N \times N$ matrices,

$$\mathfrak{gl}\left(N,\, \mathbb{R}\right) = \left\{X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}\left(\mathbb{R}\right)\right\} = \mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)\,. \tag{2.32}$$

In what follows we will use the notation $\mathfrak{gl}\left(N,\, \mathbb{R}\right)$ and $\mathrm{End}\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ interchangeably. The (real) dimension of $\mathfrak{gl}\left(N,\, \mathbb{R}\right)$ equals N^2. The special linear group $SL(N,\, \mathbb{R})$ consists of invertible matrices having the unit determinant,

$$SL(N,\, \mathbb{R}) = \left\{g \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}\left(\mathbb{R}\right) \,|\, \det\left(g\right) = 1\right\}\,. \tag{2.33}$$

The Lie algebra of $SL\left(N, \mathbb{R}\right)$, $\mathfrak{sl}\left(N,\, \mathbb{R}\right)$, consists of $N \times N$ real traceless matrices,

$$\mathfrak{sl}\left(N,\, \mathbb{R}\right) = \left\{X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}\left(\mathbb{R}\right) \,|\, \mathrm{tr}\left(X\right) = 0\right\}. \tag{2.34}$$

The (real) dimension of $\mathfrak{sl}\left(N,\, \mathbb{R}\right)$ equals $N^2 - 1$. In what follows we will be considering the complex analogue of $SL(N,\, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathfrak{sl}\left(N,\, \mathbb{R}\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned} SL(N,\, \mathbb{C}) &= \left\{g \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}\left(\mathbb{C}\right) \,|\, \det\left(g\right) = 1\right\}\,, \\ \mathfrak{sl}\left(N,\, \mathbb{C}\right) &= \left\{X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}\left(\mathbb{C}\right) \,|\, \mathrm{tr}\left(X\right) = 0\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

[13] A manifold $\mathcal{N}$ is an embedded submanifold of a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ if there exist bijective differential mapping $F : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{M}$.

The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{C})$ can be interpreted as a Lie algebra over the field of complex or real numbers. We have $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{C})) = N^2 - 1$, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{C})) = 2N^2 - 2$.

2. Unitary and special unitary group The unitary group in dimension N is defined as a set of $N \times N$ unitary matrices,

$$U(N) = \left\{ g \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{C}) \,|\, gg^\dagger = \mathbb{I} \right\} . \tag{2.36}$$

The Lie algebra of $U(N)$, $\mathfrak{u}(N)$, corresponds to the space of all $N \times N$ anti-Hermitian matrices,

$$\mathfrak{u}(N) = \left\{ X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{C}) \,|\, X^\dagger = -X \right\} . \tag{2.37}$$

The algebra $\mathfrak{u}(N)$ is a real Lie algebra of dimension N^2.

At this point we would like to make a remark concerning the difference between conventions used by physicists and mathematicians in the definition of the Lie algebra of the matrix Lie group being a subgroup of the unitary group. In the physical literature in such cases one usually defines the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ via

$$X \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{Phys}} \iff \exp(iX) \in G . \tag{2.38}$$

The above is in contrast to the condition (2.29). As a consequence of (2.38) we have $i[X, Y] \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{Phys}}$, for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}_{\text{Phys}}$. Adapting the "physical" convention to the case of the unitary group we get that $\mathfrak{u}(N)_{\text{Phys}}$ consisting of Hermitian matrices. In what follows we will consequently use the mathematical convention for the definition of a Lie algebra.

The special unitary group $SU(N)$ and the corresponding Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ are defined analogously as the special linear group and its Lie algebra,

$$\begin{aligned} SU(N) &= \left\{ g \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{C}) \,|\, gg^\dagger = \mathbb{I},\, \det(g) = 1 \right\} , \\ \mathfrak{su}(N) &= \left\{ X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{C}) \,|\, X^\dagger = -X,\, \operatorname{tr}(X) = 0 \right\} . \end{aligned} \tag{2.39}$$

The real Lie algebra $su(N)$ has dimension $N^2 - 1$.

3. Orthogonal and special orthogonal groups The orthogonal group $O(N)$ is defined via,

$$O(N) = \left\{ g \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{R}) \,|\, gg^T = \mathbb{I} \right\} , \tag{2.40}$$

where X^T denotes the transpose of the matrix X. The Lie algebra of $O(N)$, $\mathfrak{o}(N)$, consists of antisymmetric real matrices,

$$\mathfrak{o}(N) = \left\{ X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{R}) \,|\, X^T = -X \right\} . \tag{2.41}$$

The dimension of $\mathfrak{o}(N)$ equals $\frac{N(N-1)}{2}$. The special orthogonal group $SO(N)$ and its Lie algebra are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} SO(N) &= \left\{ g \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{R}) \,|\, gg^T = \mathbb{I},\, \det(g) = 1 \right\} , \\ \mathfrak{so}(N) &= \mathfrak{o}(N) = \left\{ X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{R}) \,|\, X^T = -X \right\} . \end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

The equality $\mathfrak{o}(N) = \mathfrak{so}(N)$ comes from the fact that the condition $\operatorname{tr}(X) = 0$ is automatically satisfied for real antisymmetric matrices.

Geometrical and algebraic properties of Lie groups and Lie algebras

Definition 2.22. A Lie group homomorphism between Lie groups G and H is defined as a smooth mapping $\Phi : G \to H$ which is at the same time a homeomorphism of groups: $\Phi(g_1 g_2) = \Phi(g_1)\Phi(g_2)$ for arbitrary $g_1, g_2 \in G$. If, in addition, Φ is a diffeomorphism of manifolds, then Φ is called the isomorphism of Lie Groups.

We have an analogous notion of a Lie algebra homomorphisms and isomorphisms.

Definition 2.23. A Lie algebra homomorphism between Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$ is a linear mapping $\phi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{h}$ that preserves a lie bracket: $\phi([X, Y]) = [\phi(X), \phi(Y)]$ for all $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. If, in addition, ϕ is invertible, then it is called an isomorphism of Lie algebras.

Fact 2.7. *Every homomorphism of Lie groups $\Phi : G \to H$ induces the homomorphism of the associated Lie algebras $\Phi_* : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{h}$. The induced homomorphism ϕ is specified uniquely by*

$$\Phi_*(X) = \tfrac{d}{dt}\big|_{t=0} \Phi(\exp[tX]) \ , \ X \in \mathfrak{g} \, . \tag{2.43}$$

Definition 2.24. A *(finite-dimensional) representation of a Lie group*[14] is a homomorphism

$$\Pi : G \to GL(\mathcal{H})$$

from a Lie group G to $GL(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is some finite dimensional, complex or real, vector space *called the carrier space* of the representation. Analogously, *representations* of Lie algebras are defined as homomorphisms from a Lie group $\mathfrak{g}$ to $End(\mathcal{H})$. In what follows we will use symbols Π and π to denote representations of respectively Lie groups and Lie algebras.

In what follows, unless it causes the ambiguity, we will refer to the carrier space $\mathcal{H}$ as to the representation itself. Also, unless we state otherwise, we will implicitly assume that the dimension of the carrier spaces of considered representations is finite. We will also refer to, for the sake of simplicity, the carrier space $\mathcal{H}$ having in mind the representation Π (or π) of the group (respectively its Lie algebra).

Many representation-theoretic properties of Lie groups (and the associated algebras) depend on their topological properties.

Definition 2.25. A matrix Lie group group G is connected if and only if any two elements $g_1, g_2 \in G$ can be connected by a continuous path. In other words there exist a continuous curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \to G$ such that $\gamma(0) = g_1$ and $\gamma(1) = g_2$.

Examples of connected matrix Lie groups include: $U(N)$, $SU(N)$, $SL(N, \mathbb{R})$ and $SO(N)$. Examples of disconnected Lie groups include: $\mathrm{GL}(N, \mathbb{R})$ and $O(N)$.

An important topological notion, stronger than the one of connectedness, is simple-connectedness of Lie groups. Intuitively, a Lie group is simply-connected if and only if every continuous loop on it can be contracted (in a continuous fashion) to a point. A formal definition reads as follows.

Definition 2.26. A matrix Lie group G is simply connected if for every continuous loop $\gamma : [0, 1] \to G$ there exist a continuous mapping $A_\gamma : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \to G$ such that for all $0 \leq s, t \leq 1$ $A_\gamma(0, t) = \gamma(t)$, $A(s, 0) = A(s, 1)$ and $A(1, t) = A(1, 0)$.

[14] By dropping the condition that G is a Lie group we obtain the usual definition of a representation of a group (without assumed additional structure).

Examples of simply connected matrix Lie groups include: $SU(N)$, $SL(N,\mathbb{R})$ and $SL(N,\mathbb{C})$. The most relevant (for the purpose of this thesis, see Subsection 3.1.5) example of a Lie group, which is not simply-connected is $SO(N)$. A representation Π of a Lie group G in a vector space $\mathcal{H}$ induces, via (2.43) the representation $\pi = \Pi_*$ of its Lie algebra in $\mathcal{H}$. The importance property of being a simply-connected Lie group stems from the fact that for simply-connected Lie group G every representation π of $\mathfrak{g}$ comes from some representation of the group G.

Fact 2.8. *Let G be a simply connected Lie group and let $\mathfrak{g}$ be its Lie algebra. Then, given a representation π of Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ in a vector space $\mathcal{H}$, there exist a unique representation Π of the Lie group G such that $\pi = \Pi_*$. In other words the representation Π is uniquely specified by the condition*

$$\exp(\pi(X)) = \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \Pi(\exp[tX]) \ , \ X \in \mathfrak{g} \, .$$

The above fact is important in practice as it is often more convenient to study representations of the Lie algebras rather than that of Lie groups. An important example [78] of a Lie group such that not every representation of its Lie algebra can be lifted to a representation of a group is the group $SO(3)$. Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, the Lie algebra of $SU(2)$. Due to simply-connectedness of $SU(2)$, every representation of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ comes from some representation of $SU(2)$. In fact for every connected Lie group G there exist a "universal cover" G' i.e simply-connected Lie group whose representations are in one-to-one correspondence with representations of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Fact 2.9. *Given a connected Lie group G there exist a universal covering group G', i.e. a simply-connected Lie group G' such such that there exist a homomorphism $\Phi : G \to G'$ (called the covering homomorphism) such that the induced Lie algebra homomorphism $\Phi_* : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}'$ is a Lie algebra isomorphism.*

Another property of some Lie groups, which simplifies a great deal their representation theory (see Section 2.4 below), is compactness.

Definition 2.27. A matrix Lie group $G \subset GL(N, \mathbb{R})$ is compact if and only if it is (as a set) bounded and closed subset of $GL(N, \mathbb{R})$.

Examples of compact matrix Lie groups include: $U(N)$, $SU(N)$, $O(N)$, and $SO(N)$. Examples of non-compact matrix Lie groups include: $GL(N, \mathbb{R})$, $GL(N, \mathbb{C})$, $SL(N, \mathbb{R})$ and $SL(N, \mathbb{C})$. The relevance and usefulness of the notion of compactness for representation theory will be discussed in Section 2.4. Here we state only some basic analytical and geometrical features of matrix Lie groups.

Fact 2.10. *([78]) On a compact matrix Lie group G there exist a bi-invariant Haar measure μ, i.e. a Borel measure on G such that for any Borel subset[15] $A \subset G$ and any $g \in G$ we have*

$$\mu(A) = \mu(gA) = \mu(Ag) \ , \tag{2.44}$$

where: $gE = \{x \in G | \, x = ga, \, a \in A\}$, $Ag = \{x \in G | \, x = ag, \, a \in A\}$. The measure μ is finite, $\mu(G) < \infty$ and is unique (up to a constant multiplicative factor).

[15] For the introduction to the measure theory see for example [58].

In what follows we will always assume that the Haar measure on G is normalized, i.e. $\mu(G)$. The concept of the Haar measure enables to introduce integration over the considered Lie group [16],

$$\mathcal{F}(G) \ni f \to \int_G d\mu(a) f(a) \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.45}$$

By the virtue of 2.44 we have

$$\int_G d\mu(a) f(ha) = \int_G d\mu(a) f(ah) = \int_G d\mu(a) f(a), \tag{2.46}$$

for all $h \in G$. Intuitively, one can think of the Haar measure μ as of the "most homogenous" measure on G (it is an analogue of the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^N$). Existence of μ gives rise to many invariant geometric structures on G. The concept of Haar measure (in the case of $G = \mathrm{U}(N)$) will be used extensively in Chapter 6 where this measure will be used to typical properties of correlations in multiparty quantum systems.

Fact 2.11. *On a compact matrix Lie group G there exist a bi-invariant metric $g \in \mathcal{T}_2^0(G)$ i.e an inner product satisfying*

$$L_a^* g = R_a^* g = g, \text{ for all } g \in G. \tag{2.47}$$

A metric g is unique up to scaling by a positive factor.

The existence of bi-invariant metric relies on the existence of bi-invariant finite measure 2.44. On the other hand, the Haar measure 2.44 can be recovered from the bi-invariant inner product g as a canonical measure induced on G by the metric (2.24).

Action of Lie groups on manifolds

Let us conclude our considerations by defining the action of Lie groups on manifolds. We say that the group G acts on a set X if there exist a mapping

$$\tau : G \times X \to X, \ (g, x) \to \tau_g(x) \in X$$

that for all $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and for all $x \in X$ satisfies $\tau_{g_1 g_2}(x) = \tau_{g_1}(\tau_{g_2}(x))$ and $\tau_e(x) = x$. We will use the commonly used notation $\tau_g(x) \equiv g.x$. If $X = \mathcal{M}$ is a manifold, G is a Lie group and the mapping τ is smooth we say that the Lie group G acts on the manifold $\mathcal{M}$. For a given element $x \in \mathcal{M}$ the set

$$G.x = \{ g.x |\ g \in G \}$$

is called the orbit of the action of G through x. Let $\mathrm{Stab}(x) \subset G$ denotes the stabilizer group of x,

$$\mathrm{Stab}(x) = \{ g \in G |\ g.x = x \}.$$

The orbit $G.x$ can be identified with the set the coset space $G/\mathrm{Stab}(x)$ of the equivalence relation in G,

$$g_1 \sim g_2 \iff g_1 = g_2 h, \text{ for some } h \in \mathrm{Stab}(x).$$

Let us denote by $[g]$ the equivalence class of the element $g \in G$, $[g] = g\mathrm{Stab}(x)$. The group G acts on $G.x = G/\mathrm{Stab}(x)$ in a natural manner. This action is defined by

$$g_1.[g] = [g_1 g], \text{ for all } g_1 \in G \text{ and } [g] \in G.x.$$

[16] We assume, in order to omit measure-theoretic details, that f is a smooth function on G. Obviously integration can be also defined for more general classes of functions.

The orbit $G.x$ posses a natural structure of the manifold [83] which is compatible with the action of G on it. This action is transitive, i.e. for arbitrary $p, q \in G.x$ there exist $\tilde{g} \in G$ such that $p = \tilde{g}.q$. Orbits of the action of the Lie group G are also called homogenous spaces of G. The following homogenous spaces will be used throughout the thesis:

- The manifold of isospectral density matrices $\Omega_{\{p_1,\ldots,p_D\}}$ in D dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

$$\Omega_{\{p_1,\ldots,p_D\}} = \{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \,|\, \mathrm{Sp}(\rho) = (p_1,\ldots,p_D)\},$$

  where $\mathrm{sp}(\rho)$ denotes the ordered spectrum of ρ, i.e. $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \ldots \geq p_D \geq 0$. The Lie group $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ acts naturally in the vector space of Hermitian operators $\mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H})$ via conjugation[17]

$$X \to UXU^\dagger\,,\; X \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H})\,,\; U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})\;.$$

  The manifold $\Omega_{\{p_1,\ldots,p_D\}}$ can be then interpreted as an orbit of the action of $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ through the state $\rho_0 = \mathrm{diag}(p_1,\ldots,p_D) \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H})$. In particular we see that the set of pure states $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is also a manifold since $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \Omega_{\{1,0,\ldots,0\}}$.
- Orbits of the action of the Lie subgroups of $G \subset \mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H})$ in $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$. In particular the sets of "non-correlated pure states" considered in this thesis will be of the form

$$\Pi(K).|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| = \left\{ |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|| \;\; |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \Pi(k)\,|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|\Pi(k)^\dagger\,,\; k \in K \right\}\,,$$

  where $|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$ is some fixed pure state, K is a compact simply-connected Lie group K and $\Pi : K \to \mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H})$ is a irreducible representation of K in $\mathcal{H}$.

2.4. Representation theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras

In this section we give a survey of the representation theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras. Representation theory of Lie groups and algebras is a vast and beautiful field and we will present only parts of it that will be used in the forthcoming chapters. For a more detailed treatment of the subject consult the relevant literature [78, 79, 82]. The section is structured as follows. We begin with recalling the standard representation-theoretic notions like irreducible representations, unitary representations, Schur lemma and basic operations on representations. In the latter part we discuss the structural theory of compact simply-connected Lie groups and semisimple Lie algebras and their representation theory. Next give a detailed description of the representation theory of the group $\mathrm{SU}(\mathrm{N})$ and the concept of Schur-Weyl duality which links the representation theory of $\mathrm{SU}(\mathrm{N})$ with that of the discrete permutation group S_m. Representation theory of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ will be used extensively in all remaining Chapters. In the last part of this section we present briefly some necessary facts from representation theory of $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$ that will be useful for discussing fermionic Gaussian states in Chapters 3, 4 and 5.

2.4.1. Basic representation theory

Definition 2.28. Let $\Pi : G \to GL(\mathcal{H})$ be a representation of a group G. Representation Π is called *reducible* if and only if there exist a proper subspace $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{H}$ which is preserved by G, i.e. $\Pi(g)\,\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{V}$ for all $g \in G$. If the representation Π is not reducible than it is called irreducible. Analogously we define the notion of reducible and irreducible representation of a Lie algebra.

[17] Instead of the action of $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ we could have equivalently consider the action of $\mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H})$.

In the study of representations of a given group G it is convenient to introduce the concept of intertwining maps. Given two representations

$$\Pi_1 : G \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_1\right), \Pi_2 : G \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_2\right)$$

of the group G we say that a linear map $F : \mathcal{H}_1 \to \mathcal{H}_2$ *intertwines* representations Π_1 and Π_2 if and only if

$$F \circ \Pi_1\left(g\right) = \Pi_2\left(g\right) \circ F$$

for all $g \in G$. Representations Π_1 and Π_2 are said to be equivalent if and only if there exist an invertible linear map F that intertwines Π_1 and Π_2. Intertwining maps between representations of Lie algebras are defined analogously. A very useful tool in the study of irreducible representations of groups and Lie algebras is Schur Lemma.

Fact 2.12. *(Schur Lemma) Let F, F' be intertwining mappings between two complex irreducible representations Π_1 and Π_2 of the group G. Then*

$$F = \alpha F',$$

where α is a complex number (possibly equal 0). Analogous result holds for intertwining maps between irreducible finite dimensional representations of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

Given a pair of representations Π_1, Π_2 of the group G, we can define their direct sum $\Pi_1 \oplus \Pi_2$ and the tensor product $\Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_2$. These are representations of the group G defined in the following manner,

$$\Pi_1 \oplus \Pi_2 : G \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2\right), g \to \Pi_1\left(g\right) \oplus \Pi_2\left(g\right), \tag{2.48}$$

$$\Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_2 : G \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2\right), g \to \Pi_1\left(g\right) \otimes \Pi_2\left(g\right). \tag{2.49}$$

Analogously, for a pair of two representations

$$\pi_1 : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_1\right), \pi_2 : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_2\right)$$

of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, we can define their sum $\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2$ and the representation $\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2$ (whose carrier space is $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$)

$$\pi_1 \oplus \pi_2 : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2\right), X \to \pi_1\left(X\right) \oplus \pi_2\left(X\right), \tag{2.50}$$

$$\pi_1 \otimes \pi_2 : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2\right), X \to \pi_1\left(X\right) \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes \pi_2\left(X\right). \tag{2.51}$$

The construction of the tensor product of representations can be also defined if we have a pair of representations of two different groups,

$$\Pi_1 : G_1 \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_1\right), \Pi_1 : G_2 \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_2\right).$$

The tensor product of representations $\Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_2$ is a representation of the group $G_1 \times G_2$ defined in a natural way

$$\Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_2 : G_1 \times G_2 \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2\right), \left(g_1, g_2\right) \to \Pi_1\left(g_1\right) \otimes \Pi_2\left(g_2\right). \tag{2.52}$$

Similarly we define the "tensor product" of a pair of representations of two different Lie algebras.

Fact 2.13. *Let $\Pi_1 : G_1 \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_1\right)$, $\Pi_2 : G_2 \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_2\right)$ be two irreducible representations of groups G_1 and G_2 respectively. Then the representation $\Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_2 : G_1 \times G_2 \to \mathrm{GL}\left(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2\right)$ (defined as in Eq.(2.52)) is irreducible.*

Definition 2.29. A finite-dimensional representation $\Pi : G \to \mathrm{GL}(\mathcal{H})$ of the group G is called completely reducible if and only if there exists a natural number K and irreducible representations $\Pi_i : G \to \mathrm{GL}(\mathcal{H}_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, M$, such that

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathcal{H}_M \,, \; \Pi = \Pi_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \Pi_M \,. \tag{2.53}$$

The concept of completely reducible representations of Lie algebras is defined in the analogous manner.

Fact 2.14. *Let $\Pi : G \to \mathrm{GL}(\mathcal{H})$ be a completely reducible representation of a Lie group G. Then the induced representation $\pi = \Pi_* : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ is also completely reducible.*

Let us introduce a convenient operation, useful in representation theory: a complexification of a real Lie algebra. Given a real Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ we define its complexification as a complex vector space, denoted by $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$, being a complexification of $\mathfrak{g}$ as a vector space[18] and endowed with a Lie product $[\cdot,\cdot]^{\mathbb{C}}$defined by

$$[X + i \cdot Y, Z + i \cdot T]^{\mathbb{C}} = [X, Z] - [Y, T] + i \cdot ([X, T] + [Y, Z]) \;, \tag{2.54}$$

where i is an imaginary unit, $X, Y, Z, T \in \mathfrak{g}$, and $[\cdot,\cdot]$ denotes the Lie bracket on $\mathfrak{g}$. Above definition ensures that $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ together with the bracket $[\cdot,\cdot]^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a Lie algebra over the field of complex numbers. In what follows we will consequently drop the superscript $\mathbb{C}$ when referring to the Lie product on $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$. In general, the complexification of a real matrix Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is given by allowing complex combinations of elements form $\mathfrak{g}$ while keeping the same matrix commutator. An important example of this construction is the relation $\mathfrak{su}(N)^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{C})$ (see Subsection 2.3.3). Given a representation π of a real Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, it is possible to extend it to the representation of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$, denoted by $\pi^{\mathbb{C}}$, in a natural manner,

$$\pi^{\mathbb{C}} : \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}) \,, \; \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \ni X + i \cdot Y \to \pi(X) + i \cdot \pi(Y) \;,$$

where $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. The complexified representation $\pi^{\mathbb{C}}$ is often simpler to investigate than π itself. On the hand, from $\pi^{\mathbb{C}}$ one can often regain the relevant representation theoretic data about π.

Fact 2.15. *A finite-dimensional representation $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is completely reducible if and only if the complexified representation $\pi^{\mathbb{C}} : \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ is completely reducible. Moreover, we have*

$$\pi = \pi_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \pi_M \,, \; \pi^{\mathbb{C}} = \pi_1^{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \ldots \oplus \pi_M^{\mathbb{C}} \,. \tag{2.55}$$

Therefore, in order to find decomposition onto irreducible components we can either decompose π ore $\pi^{\mathbb{C}}$.

In quantum mechanics (but also in pure representation theory) special role is played by unitary representations of groups, i.e. representations taking values in unitary operators on some Hilbert space,

$$\Pi : G \to \mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H}) \;. \tag{2.56}$$

[18] A complexification of a real vector space $\mathcal{V}$ with a basis $\{|v_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$ is a complex vector space $\mathcal{V}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ where multiplication by scalars is extended to the field of complex numbers and as set $\{|v_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$ remains a basis. for the formal definition see [79].

Using (2.43) one easily checks that in the case when G is a Lie group, the induced representation $\pi = \Pi_*$ of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}\,(G)$ takes values in anti-Hermitian operators (we call such representation anti-Hermitian),

$$\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to i \cdot \mathrm{Herm}\,(\mathcal{H}) \ . \tag{2.57}$$

The relevance of unitary representations in physics comes from the fact that they describe symmetries of quantum systems [79] (that will be the case also in this thesis). On the mathematical side it is often possible to consider a given representation as a unitary representation (with respect to the suitably chosen inner product).

Fact 2.16. *Unitary representations of groups are completely reducible. Every representation* $\Pi : G \to \mathrm{U}\,(\mathcal{H})$ *of a compact Lie group* G *is a unitary representation with respect to a suitably chosen inner product.*

A given Lie group G acts in a natural manner on its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ via the so-called adjoint representation, denoted by Ad. For simplicity we assume that we deal with matrix Lie groups but the general construction can be repeated also for the general Lie groups. The adjoint representation of the matrix Lie group G is given by

$$\mathrm{Ad} : G \to \mathrm{GL}\,(\mathfrak{g})\,,\ \mathrm{Ad}_g X = g \cdot X \cdot g^{-1}\,, \tag{2.58}$$

where $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, $g \in G$ and the expression $\mathrm{Ad}_f X = g \cdot X \cdot g^{-1}$ is to be understood in a sense of multiplication of matrices. In what follows we will use the customary notation for the adjoint representation, identifying $\mathrm{Ad}\,(g) \equiv \mathrm{Ad}_g$. The action of G on $\mathfrak{g}$ induces, via (2.43), the representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ on itself, also called the adjoint representation and denoted by ad. Straightforward computation leads to the following expression,

$$\mathrm{ad} : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}\,(\mathfrak{g})\,,\ \mathrm{ad}_Y X = [Y,\, X]\ , \tag{2.59}$$

where $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $[\cdot,\cdot]$ is the Lie bracket in $\mathfrak{g}$. In what follows we will use the customary notation, identifying $\mathrm{ad}_Y \equiv \mathrm{ad}\,(Y)$. The adjoint representation ad of a Lie algebra is, as we will see in the next subsection, a useful tool in the representation theory of semisimple Lie algebras. The Killing form Kill is a bilinear symmetric form on a (real) Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ defined by[19]

$$\mathrm{Kill} : \mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g} \to \mathbb{R},\ \mathrm{Kill}\,(X, Y) = \mathrm{tr}\,(\mathrm{ad}_X \circ \mathrm{ad}_Y)\ , \tag{2.60}$$

where $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. One easily checks that Kill is indeed symmetric (it follows from the fact that $\mathrm{tr}\,(A \circ B) = \mathrm{tr}\,(B \circ A)$ for arbitrary linear operators $A, B \in \mathrm{End}\,(\mathfrak{g})$) and that the following identities hold

$$\mathrm{Kill}\,(\mathrm{Ad}_g X, \mathrm{Ad}_g Y) = \mathrm{Kill}\,(X, Y)\ , \tag{2.61}$$

$$\mathrm{Kill}\,(\mathrm{ad}_Z X, Y) = -\mathrm{Kill}\,(X, \mathrm{ad}_Z Y)\ , \tag{2.62}$$

For $X, Y, Z \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $g \in G$. Equation (2.61) means that Kill is invariant under the action of G on $\mathfrak{g}$ via Ad. Condition (2.62) follows easily from (2.61) and shows that for all $Z \in \mathfrak{g}$ the mapping $\mathrm{ad}_Z : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}$ is skew-symmetric (with respect to the symmetric form Kill).

Fact 2.17. *(Cartan criterion) A real Lie algebra* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is a Lie algebra of some compact Lie group* G *if and only if* $\mathrm{Kill}\,(X, X) \leq 0$ *for all* $X \in \mathfrak{g}$.

[19] If the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is defined over $\mathbb{C}$ then B takes values in $\mathbb{C}$

2.4.2. Representation theory of compact simply-connected Lie groups and semisimple Lie algebras

Compact simply-connected Lie groups form an important class of groups whose representation theory is very well understood [78]. Notions introduced in this subsection will be used throughout the thesis as we will make use almost exclusively compact simply-connected Lie groups (with particular emphasis on groups $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ and $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$ - see Subsections 2.4.3 and 2.4.4 below).

Let us start with a definition of the simple complex Lie algebra. In order to define it we need a notion of an ideal in a Lie algebra. An ideal $\mathfrak{I}$ in a (complex or real) Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is a subspace of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that

$$[X, Y] \in \mathfrak{I}$$

for all $X \in \mathfrak{I}$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. Every Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ possesses two trivial ideals: null ideal$\{0\}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ itself.

Definition 2.30. A complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is called simple if it is nonabelian and does not posses nontrivial ideals.

We will now give a list of equivalent definitions of semisimple complex Lie algebras

Definition 2.31. A complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is called semisimple if and only if the following equivalent (the proof of the equivalence can be found in [82]) conditions are satisfied

- Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is a direct sum of simple Lie algebras

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathfrak{g}_m \,.$$

- The Killing form Kill of $\mathfrak{g}$ is non-degenerate:

$$\mathrm{Kill}\,(X, X) = 0 \iff X = 0\,.$$

- We have $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$, where $\mathfrak{k} = \mathrm{Lie}\,(K)$ is a Lie algebra of compact simply-connected Lie group K.

From the third point from the list above and Facts 2.8, 2.15 and 2.16 we get the following characterization of representations of semisimple Lie algebras. In the following, unless we specify otherwise, symbols $\mathfrak{g}$,$\mathfrak{k}$ and K will have the meaning described in Definition 2.31.

Fact 2.18. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a semisimple complex Lie algebra. Then, the following hold*

- *Every representation $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$ is completely reducible:*

$$\pi = \pi_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \pi_n\,,\ \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathcal{H}_n\,, \tag{2.63}$$

  where $\pi_i : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathcal{H}_i$ are irreducible representations. Subspaces $\mathcal{H}_i$ are also carrier spaces of irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{k}$ and K respectively.
- *Each irreducible representation π of $\mathfrak{g}$ defines a unique irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{k}$ denoted, by the abuse of notation, also by π (and vice versa).*
- *Each irreducible representationπ of $\mathfrak{g}$ defines a unique irreducible representation of K denoted by Π (and vice versa).*

By the virtue of the above Fact one can study interchangeably representations of $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathfrak{k}$ and K.

Directly from the definition of semisimple complex Lie algebra we have.

Fact 2.19. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a one-dimensional carrier space of a representation π of a semisimple complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Then the representation π must be trivial, i.e. $\pi(X) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}$.*

We have the analogous results for one-dimensional representations of compact simply-connected Lie group K (in this case to every $k \in K$ a representation Π associates the identity operator), or its Lie algebra, $\mathfrak{k} = \mathrm{Lie}(K)$).

In what follows we will present a brief survey of abstract structure theory of semisimple Lie algebras and their representation theory. Before that we will, however, discuss briefly the simplest example of a semisimple Lie algebra: $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ which is a complexification of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, a Lie algebra of a compact simply-connected Lie group $\mathrm{K} = \mathrm{SU}(2)$ (see subsection 2.3.3). During the presentation of the case of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ we will introduce the terminology that will be used during the discussion of general semisimple Lie algebras.

Recall that that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ consists of traceless anti-Hermitian 2×2 matrices. Let us chose the following basis of this Lie algebra

$$\tau_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tau_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tau_z = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that $\tau_\alpha = i\sigma_\alpha$ $(\alpha = x, y, z)$, where σ_α denote the standard Pauli matrices. In the complexified algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ we chose the following basis

$$E_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, E_- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, H = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.64}$$

Notice that $E_\pm = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_x \pm i\sigma_y)$ correspond to the usual ladder operators[20] in quantum mechanics and that $H = \sigma_z$. Let us write down the commutation relation for the operators from Eq.(2.64).

$$[E_+, E_-] = H,\ [H, E_+] = 2E_+,\ [H, E_-] = 2E_-. \tag{2.65}$$

Let us introduce now some terminology. One dimensional complex subspace $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{H\}$ is called the *Cartan algebra* of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. Operators E_+ and E_- are called respectively positive and negative *root vectors*. In what follows we will rephrase in the mathematical language the usual discussion of the structure of irreducible finite-dimensional representations of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. Let $\pi : \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ be a finite dimensional representation of Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. From Fact (2.18) it follows that π is induced from the unitary representation of the Lie group $\mathrm{SU}(2)$. Consequently, the operator $\pi(H)$ is Hermitian and thus diagonalizable. Let $|\psi_\lambda\rangle$ denote the eigenvector of $\pi(H)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue λ. From the commutation relations (2.65) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(H)\pi(E_+)|\psi_\lambda\rangle &= (\lambda+2)\pi(E_+)|\psi_\lambda\rangle, \\ \pi(H)\pi(E_-)|\psi_\lambda\rangle &= (\lambda-2)\pi(E_-)|\psi_\lambda\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{2.66}$$

Therefore either $\pi(E_+)|\psi_\lambda\rangle = 0$ or $\pi(E_+)|\psi_\lambda\rangle$ is an eigenvector of $\pi(H)$ with the eigenvalue $\lambda + 2$ (the analogous statement holds for $\pi(E_-)|\psi_\lambda\rangle$). Eigenvectors of the operator $\pi(H)$ are called *weight vectors* and the corresponding eigenvalues are called *weights*. Weight vectors $|\psi_\lambda\rangle$ satisfying $\pi(E_+)|\psi_\lambda\rangle = 0$ are called the *highest weight vectors*. Respectively weight vectors satisfying satisfying $\pi(E_-)|\psi_\lambda\rangle = 0$ are called the *lowest weight vectors*.

We now describe the structure of irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. Let $m \geq 0$ be a non-negative integer. We define an irreducible representation $\pi_m : \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ in $m+1$

[20] Recall that the ladder operators do not belong to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$.

dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. A representation π_m is specified uniquely by the highest weight $|\psi_0\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ having the following properties

$$\pi_m(H)|\psi_0\rangle = m|\psi_m\rangle\,,\ \pi_m(E_+)|\psi_0\rangle = 0\,,\ \pi_m(E_-)|\psi_0\rangle \neq 0\,. \tag{2.67}$$

We have

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\left\{\{|\psi_k\rangle\}_{k=0}^{k=m}\right\}\,,$$

where $|\psi_k\rangle = \pi_m(E_-)^k|\psi_0\rangle$ satisfy $\pi_m(H)|\psi_k\rangle = (m-2k)|\psi_k\rangle$ and $\pi_m(E_-)|\psi_m\rangle = 0$. The action of $\pi_m(E_+)$ on $|\psi_k\rangle$ can be deduced from 2.65 and from the fact that we require π_m to be a representation of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. The representation described above is equivalent to the well-known spin $2m$ representation of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$. Moreover, every finite-dimensional irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ is equivalent to π_m specified by Eq.(2.67) for some $m \geq 0$.

We can now move to the presentation of the representation theory of semisimple complex Lie algebras. We will only glimpse this beautiful subject. Almost all definitions and Facts which we state below stem from a comprehensive book of Brian C. Hall [78].

Definition 2.32. The Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a complex subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ characterized by either of the following equivalent conditions:

- $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{t}^{\mathbb{C}}$, where $\mathfrak{t}$ is a Lie algebra of a maximal torus T in the Lie group K[21].
- $\mathfrak{h}$ is an abelian subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ satisfying self-normalizing property,

$$[X,\,Y] \in \mathfrak{h} \implies Y \in \mathfrak{h}\,, \tag{2.68}$$

  for all $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ and all $Y \in \mathfrak{h}$.

Note that form (2.68) and form the fact that $\mathfrak{h}$ is abelian it follows that $[X,\,Y] \in \mathfrak{h}$ implies $Y = 0$. The dimension of $\mathfrak{h}$ is called the rank of $\mathfrak{g}$ (or equivalently, the rank of $\mathfrak{k}$ or K) and will be denoted by r. The

Fact 2.20. *(Hall [78]) On a semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ there exist a $1\frac{1}{2}$ linear inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ such that the adjoint action of K on $\mathfrak{g}$ is unitary,*

$$\langle \mathrm{Ad}_k X|\mathrm{Ad}_k Y\rangle = \langle X|Y\rangle\,, \tag{2.69}$$

for all $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ and all $k \in K$.

In what follows we will assume that we have chosen a fixed K-invariant inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ on $\mathfrak{g}$. The facts that we are going to present do not depend on this choice. For the cases of groups $K = \mathrm{SU}(N)$ and $K = \mathrm{Spin}(2\mathrm{d})$ (and the corresponding semisimple Lie algebras) that will be used throughout this thesis (c.f. Chapters 3, 5 and 6) we will use a concrete K-invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(K)^{\mathbb{C}}$(see Subsections 2.4.3 and 2.4.4).

Form the Fact 2.20 it follows that the adjoint representation of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ is anti-Hermitian,

$$\mathfrak{k} \to i \cdot \mathrm{Herm}(\mathfrak{g})\ ,\ X \to \mathrm{ad}_X\,. \tag{2.70}$$

Consequently, form the definition of the Cartan subalgebra it follows that $\mathfrak{g}$ decomposes onto joint eigenspaces of mutually commuting operators ad_H, where $H \in \mathfrak{h}$. The decomposition reads,

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha\,, \tag{2.71}$$

[21] A torus T in a compact Lie group K is a compact connected abelian subgroup of K. A maximal torus in K is a torus which is not contained in any other torus of K.

where the subspace $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ is spanned by $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that there exist a nonzero element $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ (the space dual to $\mathfrak{h}$) for which

$$\mathrm{ad}_H(X) = \alpha(H)X\,, \tag{2.72}$$

for all $H \in \mathfrak{h}$. Such $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ are called *roots* whereas $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ are called *root spaces*. The collection of all roots of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{g})$. From (2.70) we conclude that for $H \in \mathfrak{t}$ we have $\alpha(H) \in i \cdot \mathbb{R}$ (in other words $\alpha(H)$ is purely imaginary). The following fact summarizes important properties of roots and root vectors.

Fact 2.21. *Let $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{g})$ be as above.*

1. *For $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{g})$ only multiples of α that belong to $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{g})$ are α and $-\alpha$.*
2. *The set of roots $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{g})$ spans $\mathfrak{h}^*$.*
3. *Subspaces $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ are one dimensional and manually orthogonal (with respect to inner product (2.69)). Moreover for $X \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, $Y \in \mathfrak{g}_\beta$ we have*

$$[X, Y] \in \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\beta}, \tag{2.73}$$

where it is assumed that $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\beta} = \{0\}$ whenever $\alpha + \beta \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{g})$.

As we will see bellow roots and root vectors play a crucial role in the representation theory of $\mathfrak{g}$ (and thus, by virtue of Fact 2.18, in the representation theory of $\mathfrak{k}$ and K). We now proceed with a few more technicalities necessary to state the *highest weight* theorem (see Fact 2.25), a theorem that characterizes all irreducible representations of semisimple complex Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}$.

Fact 2.22. *It is possible to chose the basis of $\mathfrak{h}^*$, denoted $\Delta = \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^r$ (elements of this set are called positive simple roots), in such a way that every root $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{g})$ has the decomposition*

$$\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_i \alpha_i\,,$$

where numbers n_i are integers, either all non-negative or all non-positive. Roots such that for all i, $m_i \geq 0$ (respectively for all i, $m_i \leq 0$) are called positive roots (respectively negative roots). We have the following decomposition (called a root decomposition) of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$,

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}_- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_+. \tag{2.74}$$

In the above the subspaces $\mathfrak{n}_\pm$ are spanned by the root vectors corresponding to the positive and, respectively, the negative roots. By the virtue of (2.73) subspaces $\mathfrak{n}_\pm$ are actually subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$.

A choice of positive simple roots Δ introduces on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ the relation of partial order. It is defined in the following way.

$$\alpha \succeq \beta \iff \alpha - \beta = \sum_{i=1}^{r} x_i \alpha_i\,,\ x_i \geq 0\,, \tag{2.75}$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.

In what follows we will consequently identify $\mathfrak{h}$ with $\mathfrak{h}^*$ via the (antilinear) pairing φ induced by the Ad_K-invariant inner product (2.69),

$$\varphi : \mathfrak{h} \to \mathfrak{h}^*\,,\ \varphi_{H_1}(H_2) = \langle H_1, H_2 \rangle\ , \tag{2.76}$$

where $H_1, H_2 \in \mathfrak{h}$. For the sake of simplicity, will not be using the mapping φ explicitly. Instead, we will just refer to $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ as to an element of $\mathfrak{h}$ by writing $\alpha(H) = \langle \alpha, H \rangle$. Consequently roots will be identified with elements of,$\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{h}$.

A convenient way of description of a representation of $\mathfrak{g}$, $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$, uses the notion of *weight vectors*, i.e. simultaneous eigenvectors of representatives of all elements from the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$. It means that $|\psi_\lambda\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ is a weight vector if:

$$\pi(H)|\psi_\lambda\rangle = \langle \lambda, H \rangle |\psi_\lambda\rangle , \tag{2.77}$$

where $H \in \mathfrak{h}$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}$ is called the *weight* associated to the weight vector $|\psi_\lambda\rangle$. The set of all weight that correspond to weight vectors in $\mathcal{H}$ are denoted by $\mathrm{wt}(\pi)$. Subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ corresponding to the same weight are called the *weight spaces* and are denoted by $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$.

Fact 2.23. *Let $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ be a representation of semisimple complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathcal{H}_\lambda, \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and $\mathrm{wt}(\pi)$ be as above.*

1. *The set weight vectors span $\mathcal{H}$.*
2. *Subspaces $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ are manually orthogonal (with respect to the K-invariant inner product on $\mathcal{H}$). Moreover for $X \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, $|\psi\rangle \in \mathfrak{g}_\beta$ we have*

$$\pi(X)|\psi_\lambda\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\lambda+\alpha}, \tag{2.78}$$

where it is assumed that $\mathcal{H}_{\lambda+\alpha} = \{0\}$ whenever $\lambda + \beta \notin \mathrm{wt}(\pi)$.

We say that a weight λ_0 is the *highest weight* if and only if $\lambda_0 \succeq \lambda$ for all weights λ in the representation[22] π. The corresponding weight vector is called the *highest weight vector* and will be denoted by $|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle$ or simply $|\psi_0\rangle$.

Definition 2.33. An element μ of $\mathfrak{h}$ is called an *integral element* if $2\frac{\langle \mu, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle}$ is an integer for all $\alpha \in \Delta$. If $2\frac{\langle \mu, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle}$ is a non-negative integer then μ is called a *dominant integral element*[23].

It turns out that weights are automatically integral elements.

Fact 2.24. *([78]) Let $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ be the representation of the semisimple complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Every weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}$ is an integral element.*

Definition 2.34. A representation $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ is called a highest weight cyclic representation if there exist $|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

- $|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle$ is a highest weight vector in the representation π;
- $\pi(X)|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{n}_+$;
- The smallest invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ is whole $\mathcal{H}$.

Fact 2.25. *(The highest weight theorem [78]) Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a semisimple complex Lie algebra. The following holds*

1. *Every irreducible finite dimensional representation π of $\mathfrak{g}$ has a highest weight λ_0, i.e.*

$$\lambda_0 - \lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{r} x_i \alpha_i \, , x_i \geq 0 \, ; \tag{2.79}$$

for all weights λ of π.

[22] Note that not all representations π admit the existence of the highest weight.

[23] The condition that $2\frac{\langle \mu, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle}$ is integer depends upon the identification (2.76). However this requirement is invariant if we think of μ as an element of $\mathfrak{h}^*$.

2. *Irreducible representations π, π' having the same highest weight are equivalent.*
3. *Every highest weight λ_0 is a dominant integral element*[24].
4. *Every irreducible representation π is a highest weight cyclic representation.*

In what follows we will use the symbol π^{λ_0} and to refer to a representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ that is characterized to a highest weight λ_0. The carrier space of this representation will be denoted by $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$. Let us remark that in the above discussion we chose some additional structures in order to describe the structure of irreducible representations of semisimple complex Lie algebras: compact real form $\mathfrak{k}$, Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$, set of positive simple roots Δ, K-invariant inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. However, it can be shown that different choices result with equivalent results [78].

Throughout the thesis we will use Fact 2.25 extensively as the majority of considered cases will correspond precisely to the setting in which a compact simply-connected Lie group K (and thus also a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$) is irreducibly represented in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$. In the next two subsections we will describe in detail how the machinery introduced above works for two compact simply-connected Lie groups $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ (the corresponding semisimple complex Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{sl}(N, \mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{su}(N)^{\mathbb{C}}$) and $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$ (the corresponding semisimple complex Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{so}(N, \mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{so}(N)^{\mathbb{C}}$).

We conclude this subsection with introducing the Casimir operator of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. This concept will be used extensively in Chapter 3. A Casimir operator $\mathcal{C}_2$ is not an element of a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ but a so-called universal enveloping algebra $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$. For the sake of completeness let us briefly introduce concept of $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$. The universal enveloping algebra $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ is the "smallest associative algebra" generated by $\mathfrak{g}$. Intuitively speaking $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a complex vector which is generated by formal products of elements from $\mathfrak{g}$, subject to the relation coming from the Lie bracket. In other words every element of $A \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a finite sum of products of the form

$$X_1 \cdot X_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_k \,,$$

where $X_i \in \mathfrak{g}$ and it is assumed that the product $\cdot \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}) \times \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ respects the commutation relation generated by the Lie bracket,

$$X \cdot Y - Y \cdot X = [X, Y] \,.$$

For the formal definition of $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ see [79]. Every representation $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ induces a representation $\tilde{\pi} : \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ of the universal enveloping Lie algebra defined on monomials in the following way

$$\tilde{\pi}(X_1 \cdot X_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_k) = \tilde{\pi}(X_1)\, \tilde{\pi}(X_2) \ldots \tilde{\pi}(X_k)$$

and extended to the whole $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ by linearity. For the sake of simplicity in what follows we use the symbol π while referring to representations of either Lie algebra or the corresponding universal enveloping algebra. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be K-invariant $1\frac{1}{2}$-linear inner product on $\mathfrak{g}$. Let use the same symbol to denote the K-invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{g}$. Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathfrak{k})}$ be the orthonormal basis of $\mathfrak{k}$. The Casimir invariant is defined in the following way

$$\mathcal{C}_2 = -\sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathfrak{g})} X_i^2 \tag{2.80}$$

It can be checked that $\mathcal{C}_2$ commutes with all elements of $\mathfrak{g}$ and therefore belongs to the center of $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$. As a result, due to Schur lemma (see Fact 2.12), representations of $\mathcal{C}_2$ act as a

[24] Not every weight λwhich is dominant integral element comes from a highest weight vector.

multiplication by a scalar on every irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ (the scalar depends upon the considered representation). It is perhaps instructive to mention at this point that in the case of SU (2) the second order Casimir equals (up to the positive constant depending on the choice of the inner product on $\mathfrak{su}(2)$) the square of the total angular momentum,

$$L^2 = \frac{1}{4}\left(\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 + \sigma_z^2\right) ,$$

where $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ denote the standard Pauli matrices. The representation of L^2 for the representation of SU (2) labeled by the total spin j equals $j\,(j+1)$. For the general semisimple Lie algebra and the representation labeled by the highest weight λ_0, the representation of the $\mathcal{C}_2$, $\pi^{\lambda_0}(C_2)$ is given by the formula:

$$\pi^{\lambda_0}(C_2) = (\lambda_0 + 2\delta, \lambda_0)\mathbb{I}\,, \tag{2.81}$$

where $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$, $\delta = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha\in\Delta}\alpha$ and $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the inner product on $\mathfrak{h}$ induced from the inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ on $\mathfrak{g}$.

2.4.3. Representation theory of the SU (N) and Schur-Weyl duality

In this part we state necessary facts concerning the representation theory of SU (N) that we employ in Chapters 3-6 to describe correlations of distinguishable particles, fermions and bosons. Representation theory of SU (N) is closely related to the representation theory of symmetric groups. This relation is known under the name Schur-Weyl duality" [82, 84, 85]. First we present the classification of all irreducible representations of SU (N) and the representation theory of symmetric group of L elements, $\mathfrak{S}_L$. Then we turn to their concrete realizations as sub representations of $\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$. Schur-Weyl duality is employed here to give the pairing of irreducible representations of SU (N) and the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_L$ that acts on $\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$ in a natural manner.

Highest weights of SU (N)

Lie group SU (N) fits into the formalism presented in Subsection 2.4.2 - it is compact and simply-connected. Therefore, finite-dimensional irreducible representations of the group, its complexification and the corresponding Lie algebras are in one to one correspondence. The Lie algebra of SU (N), $\mathfrak{su}(N)$, consists of traceless anti-Hermitian matrices acting on $\mathbb{C}^N$:

$$\mathfrak{su}(N) = \left\{X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{C})\,|X^\dagger = -X,\, \mathrm{tr}X = 0\right\} . \tag{2.82}$$

The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}$ of a maximal torus in SU (N) can be chosen to consist of diagonal, traceless and anti-Hermitian matrices:

$$\mathfrak{t} = \left\{X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{C})\,|X \text{ - diagonal},\, X^\dagger = -X,\, \mathrm{tr}X = 0\right\} . \tag{2.83}$$

The complexification of $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ consists of complex traceless matrices:

$$\mathfrak{su}(N)^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{sl}(N,\mathbb{C}) = \{X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{C})\,|\,\mathrm{tr}X = 0\} . \tag{2.84}$$

The corresponding complexified Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{h}$ consists of diagonal traceless matrices:

$$\mathfrak{t}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{h} = \{X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{C})\,|X \text{ - diagonal}, \mathrm{tr}X = 0\} . \tag{2.85}$$

On $\mathfrak{sl}(N,\mathbb{C})$ we have an SU (N)-invariant skew-linear inner product given by the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product given by:

$$\langle X, Y\rangle_{\mathrm{HS}} = \mathrm{tr}\left(X^{\dagger}Y\right), \tag{2.86}$$

for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{sl}(N,\mathbb{C})$. We chose the following set of simple positive roots $\Delta \subset \mathfrak{h}$:

$$\Delta = \{E_{1,1} - E_{2,2},\ E_{2,2} - E_{3,3}, \ldots,\ E_{N-1,N-1} - E_{N,N}\}\ , \tag{2.87}$$

where: $E_{i,j} = |i\rangle\langle j|$ and $|i\rangle$ denotes the i'th element of the standard basis in $\mathbb{C}^N$. This choice of positive roots Δ corresponds to

$$\mathfrak{n}_+ = span_{\mathbb{C}}\{E_{i,j} | i < j\} \quad \text{(strictly upper triangular matrices)}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{n}_- = span_{\mathbb{C}}\{E_{i,j} | i > j\} \quad \text{(strictly lower triangular matrices)}$$

Moreover, one easily checks that the positive root corresponding to the root vector $E_{i,j}$ $(i \neq j)$ equals $E_{i,i} - E_{j,j}$. Let now $\pi : \mathfrak{sl}(N,\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the representation of $\mathfrak{sl}(N,\mathbb{C})$ in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. As it was explained in the previous subsection any weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}$ encodes the simultaneous eigenvalues of representatives of operators $\pi(E_{i,i} - E_{i+1,i+1})$ on a weight vector $|\psi_\lambda\rangle$:

$$\pi(E_{i,i} - E_{i+1,i+1})|\psi_\lambda\rangle = \lambda_i|\psi_\lambda\rangle\ i = 1, \ldots, N-1\,. \tag{2.88}$$

where λ_i labels (real) eigenvalue of the operator $E_{i,i} - E_{i+1,i+1}$. From Fact 2.24 it follows that for each weight λ the corresponding λ_i are integers. The highest weights $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}$ are dominant integral elements, i.e. every coefficient λ_i is non-negative. Let us introduce the following relabeling of the highest weights of $\mathrm{sl}(N,\mathbb{C})$:

$$\lambda \equiv \left(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\lambda}_{d-1}\right)\ , \tag{2.89}$$

where

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i = \sum_{k=i}^{d-1} \lambda_k\,.$$

Notice that numbers $\left\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\right\}_{i=1}^{d-1}$ satisfy $\tilde{\lambda}_1 \geq \tilde{\lambda}_2 \geq \ldots \geq \tilde{\lambda}_{d-1}$. Therefore they form *a partition* of a number $|\lambda| = \sum_{k=i}^{d-1} \tilde{\lambda}_i$ which we call the *length of the weight* λ. For the highest weight λ we denote the corresponding irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{sl}(N)$ as $\mathcal{H}_N^\lambda$. We observe that dominant integral weights of length $L \in \mathbb{N}$ correspond to partition of the number m onto array of $N-1$ non-negative and non-increasing integers. We shall write $\lambda \vdash L$ when we refer to such partitions. One can also represent λ by a *Young diagram* - a collection of boxes arranged in left-justified rows, with non increasing lengths when looked from top to the bottom. For example, Young tableau corresponding to $\lambda = (4,2,1)$ is:



For the purpose of the latter discussion we define the height of the Young diagram, $d(\lambda)$, as a number of rows composing the diagram. The above interpretations of highest weights of SU (N) establish the link between representation theory of SU (N) and that of permutation groups. In the rest of this section this section we will denote by $\mathcal{H}_N^\lambda$ the irreducible representation of SU (N) characterized by the highest weight λ.

Representations of the permutation group $\mathfrak{S}_L$

All irreducible representations of the permutation group $\mathfrak{S}_L$ can be labeled by Young diagrams of size L. Let us briefly describe the construction of irreducible representation $\mathcal{V}^\lambda$ corresponding to shape $\lambda \vdash L$. A *Young tableaux* is obtained from the Young diagram by filling it with numbers from the set $1, \ldots, L$ (with no repetitions). For instance from $\lambda = (4, 2, 1)$ we can construct the following Young tableau:

7	3	1	2
4	5		
6			

.

Let V^λ be a complex vector space formed by formal linear combinations of all $L!$ Young tableaux of the shape λ. Permutation group $\mathfrak{S}_L$ acts on different Young tableaux by permuting numbers that fill them. This action can be extended (by linearity) to the whole V^λ making it the carrier space of the representation of $\mathfrak{S}_L$. Representation $\mathbb{S}^\lambda$ is obtained as a quotient of V^λ under the equivalence relation defined as follows. First, one identifies Young tableaux that have the same numbers in their rows. For example:

1	3	5	7
2	4		
6			

$\sim$

1	5	3	7
4	2		
6			

.

Moreover, two Young tableaux having the same numbers in their columns are identified up to the sign of the permutation that transforms one onto another. For example:

1	3	5	7
2	4		
6			

$\sim -$

2	3	5	7
1	4		
6			

.

The resulting quotient of the space V^λ respects the action of the group $\mathfrak{S}_L$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{V}^\lambda$. It can be checked that the space $\mathbb{S}^\lambda$ has a basis formed by *standard Young tableaux* [82]. Standard young tableau is a tableau whose entries in each row and each column are increasing (when read from left to the right and from the top to the bottom). For example

1	2	3	5
4	7		
6			

is a standard Young tableau.

Schur-Weyl duality

Consider the diagonal representation $\Pi^{\otimes L} : \mathrm{SU}(N) \to \mathrm{U}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}\right)$ of a Lie group $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ in$\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$,

$$\Pi^{\otimes m}(U)\left(|\phi_1\rangle \otimes |\phi_2\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |\phi_L\rangle\right) = U|\phi_1\rangle \otimes U|\phi_2\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes U|\phi_L\rangle\,, \tag{2.90}$$

where $|\phi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^N$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$. On $\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$ we have also a natural representation of the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_L$,

$$\rho(\sigma)\left(|\phi_1\rangle \otimes |\phi_2\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |\phi_L\rangle\right) = |\phi_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}\rangle \otimes |\phi_{\sigma^{-1}(2)}\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |\phi_{\sigma^{-1}(L)}\rangle\,, \tag{2.91}$$

where $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_L$. The Schur-Weyl duality describes the pairing between irreducible representations of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ and $\mathfrak{S}_L$ that appear in $\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$. In this paragraph we state main ideas associated with this duality. Let us first note that

$$\left[\rho(\sigma)\,,\, \Pi^{\otimes L}(U)\right] = 0\,, \tag{2.92}$$

for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_L$ and all $U \in \mathrm{SU}(N)$. Actually a much stronger condition holds. In order to state this result let us first define the concept of the *commutant*. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite dimensional Hilbert space and let $S \subset \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ be a subset of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ which is closed under Hermitian conjugation[25] (for $s \in S$ we have $s^\dagger \in S$). The *commutant* of S, denoted by $\mathrm{comm}(S)$, consists of all operators that commute with elements of S:

$$\mathrm{Comm}(S) = \left\{X \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H}) \,|\, [X,\, s] = 0,\, \forall_{s\in S}\right\}\,. \tag{2.93}$$

One checks that $\mathrm{comm}(S)$ form a $\mathbb{C}^*$ algebra[26] in $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\mathbb{C}\left[\rho(\mathfrak{S}_L)\right]$ and $\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi^{\otimes L}(\mathrm{SU}(N))\right]$ be $\mathbb{C}^*$ algebras of operators in $\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$ generated by the image of the representation ρ and $\Pi^{\otimes L}$ respectively. The relation between representation of $\mathfrak{S}_L$ and $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ is given by the following fact.

Fact 2.26. *(Schur-Weyl duality [82]) Let $\Pi^{\otimes L}$ and ρ be defined as above. The following equalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi^{\otimes L}(\mathrm{SU}(N))\right) &= \mathbb{C}\left[\rho(\mathfrak{S}_L)\right]\,,\\ \mathrm{Comm}\left(\rho(\mathfrak{S}_L)\right) &= \mathbb{C}\left[\Pi^{\otimes L}(\mathrm{SU}(N))\right]\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.94}$$

Moreover, the Hilbert space $\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$ treated as a carrier space of the representation of the group $\mathfrak{S}_L \times \mathrm{SU}(N)$ decomposes onto irreducible components as follows

$$\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L} \approx \bigoplus_{\substack{\lambda \vdash L\\ d(\lambda) \le N}} \mathcal{V}^\lambda \otimes \mathcal{H}_N^\lambda\,, \tag{2.95}$$

where$\approx$ is the equivalence of representations and $\mathbb{S}^\lambda \otimes \mathcal{H}_N^\lambda$ is an irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{S}_L \times \mathrm{SU}(N)$.

[25] Actually it is possible to define the concept of the commutant of the set $\mathcal{S}$ without this requirement. However, all the cases that will be considered by us are of this form.

[26] A $\mathbb{C}^*$ algebra in $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ is a vector subspace of $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$ which us closed under operator composition and taking the Hermitian conjugate.

The Meaning of the tensor product $\mathcal{V}^{\lambda} \otimes \mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda}$ in (2.95)is the following: $\mathfrak{S}_L$ acts on the first factor of the tensor product whereas $SU(N)$ acts in the second one.

Remark. The Schur-Weyl duality is usually stated in the form of duality between the action of $\mathfrak{S}_L$ and $\mathrm{U}(N)$ (or $\mathrm{GL}(N)$). However, due to the equalities[27]

$$\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi^{\otimes L}(\mathrm{SU}(N))\right) = \mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi^{\otimes L}(\mathrm{U}(N))\right) ,$$
$$\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi^{\otimes L}(\mathrm{SU}(N))\right] = \mathbb{C}\left[\Pi^{\otimes L}(\mathrm{U}(N))\right] ,$$

equations (2.94) remain valid if we replace the group $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ by $\mathrm{U}(N)$. In the beginning of this section we saw that irreducible representations $\mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda}$ of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ are labeled by $\lambda \vdash L$ satisfying the condition $d(\lambda) \leq N-1$. For $L \geq N$ in Eq.(2.95) we have Young diagrams having the height $d(\lambda) = L$. It turns out (see that discussion of Schur-Weyl duality in [86]) we have the equivalence of irreducible representations $\mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda}, \mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda'}$ of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ characterized by the Young diagrams λ, λ' ($d(\lambda) \leq N$, $d(\lambda') \leq N$) satisfying

$$\lambda = \lambda' + m\left(\overbrace{1,\ldots,1}^{N}\right) . \tag{2.96}$$

A decomposition (2.95) can be considered as a generalization the well-known decomposition $\mathbb{C}^N \otimes \mathbb{C}^N = \mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right) \oplus \bigwedge^2\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)$. In this case we have

$$\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi^{\otimes 2}(\mathrm{SU}(N))\right) = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{I}, \mathbb{S}\} , \tag{2.97}$$

where $\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator on $\mathbb{C}^N \otimes \mathbb{C}^N$ and $\mathbb{S}$ is the standard swap operator. Note that the case with $L=2$ is exceptional in a sense that $\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes 2}$ is a multiplicity-free representation[28] of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$. For $L>2$ this is no longer the case as representations $\mathcal{V}^{\lambda}$ are not one dimensional. For every standard Young tableau $\mathcal{T}$ of the shape λ the corresponding vector $v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{V}^{\lambda}$ defines an irreducible subrepresentations of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ of type $\mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda}$: $\mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda,\mathcal{T}} \approx v_{\mathcal{T}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda}$. Linear subspace $\mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda,\mathcal{T}} \subset \left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$ is uniquely characterized by the action of $\mathfrak{S}_L$ on the vector $v_{\mathcal{T}}$. According to the construction of the representation $\mathcal{V}^{\lambda}$, the vector $v_{\mathcal{T}}$ is symmetric under the action of $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_L$, when σ preserves the rows of $\mathcal{T}$. Similarly $v_{\mathcal{T}}$ is completely antisymmetric under the action of σ that independently act on different columns of $\mathcal{T}$. For example the Young tableau

$$\mathcal{T} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}\hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & 7 \\ \cline{1-2} 6 \\ \cline{1-1} \end{array} \tag{2.98}$$

defines the subspace $\mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda,\mathcal{T}}$ of $\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes 7}$ which is totally symmetric under independent permutations within sets of indices (in a sense of Eq. (2.91)) forming rows of $\mathcal{T}$: $\{1,2,3,5\}$, $\{4,7\}$and $\{6\}$. Similarly, $\mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda,\mathcal{T}}$ is totally antisymmetric under independent permutations within indices forming columns of $\mathcal{T}$: $\{1,4,6\}$, $\{2,7\}$ and $\{5\}$. For the general Young tableau $\mathcal{T}$ one can construct the projector onto $\mathcal{H}_N^{\lambda,\mathcal{T}}$, $\mathbb{P}_{\lambda,\mathcal{T}} : \left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L} \to \left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$. It is given by the formula [84]:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\lambda,\mathcal{T}} = \alpha(\lambda)\, \mathbb{P}^{+}_{r(\mathcal{T})} \mathbb{P}^{-}_{c(\mathcal{T})}, \tag{2.99}$$

[27] The representation $\Pi^{\otimes L}$ of $\mathrm{U}(N)$ is defined in analogous manner as the representation of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$.

[28] A representation is multiplicity-free if and only if it decomposition onto irreducible components does not contain two copies of the same irreducible representation.

where $\mathbb{P}^{+}_{r(\mathcal{T})}$ is the projector onto subspace of $\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)^{\otimes L}$ totally symmetric under permutations that preserve rows of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{-}_{c(\mathcal{T})}$ is the projector onto the subspace that is totally antisymmetric under permutations that preserve columns of $\mathcal{T}$. Scalar factor $\alpha(\lambda)$ can in Eq. (2.99) is a rational number depending upon the shape of the Young tableau $\mathcal{T}$. It ensures that $\left(\mathbb{P}_{\lambda,\mathcal{T}}\right)^2 = \mathbb{P}_{\lambda,\mathcal{T}}$ (operators $\mathbb{P}^{+}_{r(\mathcal{T})}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{-}_{c(\mathcal{T})}$ do not commute in general). The scalar $\alpha(\lambda)$ can be computed according to the formula [84]

$$\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{c_\lambda \cdot r_\lambda}{g_\lambda}. \tag{2.100}$$

The meaning of symbol that appear in (2.100) is the following

$$c_\lambda = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathrm{nc}(\lambda)} c_i!\,, r_\lambda = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathrm{nr}(\lambda)} r_i!\,,$$

where $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^{\mathrm{nc}(\lambda)}$ ($\{r_i\}_{i=1}^{\mathrm{nr}(\lambda)}$) is a set consisting of number of boxes that appear in each column (respectively each row) of the Young diagram λ. The scalar g_λ is given by the "hook" rule: enter into each box of λ the number of boxes below and to the left of the box, including the box itself. Then g_λ is the product of the numbers in all the boxes.

A particularly simple examples of Young tableaux are these coming only form a Young diagram having only one row or one column. In terms of the notation (2.89) these are

$$\lambda_b = (L, 0, \ldots, 0)\ ,\ \lambda_f = \begin{pmatrix} \overbrace{1, 1, \ldots 1}^{L}, 0, \ldots, 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The representations that correspond to these Young diagrams are: the standard "bosonic" representation of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ and respectively the standard "fermionic" representation of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ (see Section (2.4.3)). The projectors that correspond to the appropriate Young tableaux $\mathcal{T}_b, \mathcal{T}_f$ are

$$\mathbb{P}_{\lambda_b,\mathcal{T}_b} = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_{\lambda_f,\mathcal{T}_f} = \mathbb{P}^{a\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}}.$$

We now give the formula for the dimension of $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda}_{N}$ and the scalar in terms of the Young diagram λ (in accordance to (2.96) we now allow weights to have the height $d(\lambda)$ at most N).

Fact 2.27. ([84]) The dimension of the irreducible representation $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda}_{N}$ of the group $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ is given by the by

$$\dim\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda}_{N}\right) = \frac{f_\lambda(N)}{g_\lambda}. \tag{2.101}$$

In the above formula g_λ is as in (2.100) *and $f_\lambda(N)$ is the polynomial in N obtained from the λ by multiplying the numbers written in the boxes of λ, according to the following rules:*

1. *The upper left box contains N.*
2. *The numbers in a row increase by one when reading from left to right..*
3. *The numbers in a column decrease by one when reading from top to bottom.*

2.4.4. Spinor representations of $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$

In this part we introduce group-theoretic tools useful for description of non-Gaussian correlations in fermionic systems (see Subsection 3.1.5). We first define the group $\mathrm{Spin}(N)$ and introduce its spinor representations: $\mathcal{H}^{+}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{-}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ of the group $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$. Then

we describe these representations from the perspective of the highest weight theory introduced in Subsection 2.4.2.

From Subsection 2.4.2 we know that there is one to one correspondence between irreducible finite dimensional representations of: compact simply-connected Lie group K, its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ and semi-simple complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Let us consider the compact Lie group $K = \mathrm{SO}(N)$ ($N > 2$). It is known [78] that $\mathrm{SO}(N)$ is not simply-connected. However, the complexified Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(N)^{\mathbb{C}}$ is semi-simple [78]. Not every irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{so}(N)$ will then lift to the representation of $\mathrm{SO}(N)$ (as in the simplest case of the group $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ and its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3) \approx \mathfrak{su}(2)$). However, due to the fact that $\mathrm{SO}(N)$ is compact and simply connected there exist [78] its *universal cover*, i.e. a compact simply-connected Lie group $\widetilde{\mathrm{SO}(N)}$ such that there exist a surjective homomorphism of Lie groups

$$h : \widetilde{\mathrm{SO}(N)} \to \mathrm{SO}(N) \tag{2.102}$$

and $\mathrm{Lie}\left(\widetilde{\mathrm{SO}(N)}\right) = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathrm{SO}(N)) = \mathfrak{so}(N)$. In what follows we will refer to $\widetilde{\mathrm{SO}(N)}$ as the Spin group $\mathrm{Spin}(N)$. We will not describe this group more explicitly here. For $N = 3$ we have $\mathrm{Spin}(3) \approx \mathrm{SU}(2)$. For the general N the group $\mathrm{Spin}(N)$ can be given a concrete realization via the use of Clifford algebras [86].

Let us now focus one the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(2d)$ of the group $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$[29] ($d > 1$). Bellow we describe, after [78], the root structure of $\mathfrak{so}(2d)^{\mathbb{C}}$and the structure of its highest weights. The Lie algebra of $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$ consists of real $2d \times 2d$ antisymmetric matrices

$$\mathfrak{so}(2d) = \left\{X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{R}) \,|X^T = -X\right\}$$

The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{t}$ of a maximal torus in $\mathfrak{so}(2d)$ is spanned by d two by two block diagonal matrices

$$\mathfrak{t} = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_d) \ ,$$

where $\theta_i = -|2i-1\rangle\langle 2i| + |2i\rangle\langle 2i-1|$. The complexification of $\mathfrak{so}(2d)$ consists of $2d \times 2d$ complex antisymmetric matrices

$$\mathfrak{so}(2d)^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{so}(2d, \mathbb{C}) = \left\{X \in \mathbb{M}_{N\times N}(\mathbb{C}) \,|X^T = -X\right\} \ .$$

The corresponding complexified Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{h}$ is given by

$$\mathfrak{h} = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_d) \ . \tag{2.103}$$

In the matrix language every operator operators $X \in \mathfrak{h}$ has a block-diagonal form. Each of d block corresponds to one θ_i and has the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_i \\ -a_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \ ,$$

for $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$. On $\mathfrak{so}(2d, \mathbb{C})$ we have an Spin(2d)-invariant skew-linear inner product given by the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product given by:

$$\langle X, Y\rangle_{\mathrm{HS}} = \mathrm{tr}(X^* Y) \ ,$$

[29] The coherent states of the group $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$ in its spinor representations will be identified with fermionic Gaussian states (see Subsection 3.1.5).

where $(\cdot)^*$ denotes the complex conjugate and $X, Y \in \mathfrak{so}(2d, \mathbb{C})$. We hose the following set of positive simple roots $\Delta \subset \mathfrak{h}$:

$$\Delta = \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{d}, \tag{2.104}$$

where

$$\alpha_i = \frac{i}{2}(\theta_i - \theta_{i+1}) \ , \ i = 1, \ldots, d-1 \,,$$

and

$$\alpha_d = \frac{i}{2}(\theta_i + \theta_{i+1}) \ .$$

Before we describe the positive and negative root spaces let us introduce the mapping

$$[\cdot]^{kl} : \mathbb{M}(2, \mathbb{C}) \to \mathfrak{so}(2d, \mathbb{C}) \ , \ 1 \leq k < l \leq d$$

that associates to any matrix $C \in \mathbb{M}(2, \mathbb{C})$ a block matrix $[C]^{kl} \in \mathfrak{so}(2d, \mathbb{C})$ that have the matrix C in the block (k, l) and the matrix $-C^T$ in the block (k, l) defined in the following. We can now describe positive and negative roots corresponding to (2.104)

$$\mathfrak{n}_+ = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}} \left\{ [C]^{kl} \middle| \ C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \ 1 \leq k < l \leq d \right\} , \tag{2.105}$$

$$\mathfrak{n}_- = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}} \left\{ [C]^{kl} \middle| \ C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \ 1 \leq k < l \leq d \right\} . \tag{2.106}$$

We now briefly describe the spinor representations of $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$. The physical significance of these representations will be explained in subsection 3.1.5. Consider a Fermionic Fock space with d dimensional single particle Hilbert space,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{d} \bigwedge^{k} \left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \ ,$$

On this space we define a set of $2d$ Majorana operators,

$$c_{2k-1} = a_k + a_k^\dagger \,, \ c_{2k} = i\left(a_k - a_k^\dagger\right) \,, k = 1, \ldots, d \,,$$

where a_k,$a_k^\dagger$ denote the standard annihilation and creation fermionic operators. Majorana operators are Hermitian, traceless and satisfy the following anticommutation relations

$$\{c_k, \, c_l\} = 2\delta_{kl} \,. \tag{2.107}$$

We define the spinor representation π_s of $\mathfrak{so}(2d)$ by defining it on a standard basis of $\mathfrak{so}(2d)$ given by the operators

$$L_{kl} = |k\rangle\langle l| - |l\rangle\langle k| \,, \ , \ (1 \leq k < l \leq 2d \,.$$

We set

$$\pi_s(L_{kl}) = \frac{1}{2} c_k c_l \,, \ (1 \leq k < l \leq 2d) \,. \tag{2.108}$$

It turns out that the above mapping actually defines a representation of $\mathfrak{so}(2d)$. Consequently, by the virtue of Fact 2.8, the representation π_s induces a representation $\Pi_s : \mathrm{Spin}(2d) \to \mathrm{U}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ of group $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$. The representation Π_s encodes exactly the parity-preserving Bogolyubov transformations on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ (c.f. Subsection 3.1.5). Application of (2.108) to operators θ_i forming the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ shows that

$$\pi_s(\theta_i) = \frac{i}{2}(2\hat{n}_k - \mathbb{I}) \ , \tag{2.109}$$

where $\hat{n}_k$ is the occupation mode operator associated to mode k and $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. Consequently, the standard Fock states $|n_1, \ldots, n_d\rangle$ (see Section 3.1.5 for the explanation of this notation) are weight vectors of $\mathfrak{so}\left(2d\right)$. Applying again (2.108) to (2.105) we get

$$\pi_s\left(\mathfrak{n}_+\right) = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}\left\{\left\{\, a_k a_l \middle|\, 1 \leq k < l \leq d\right\}, \left\{ a_k a_l^\dagger \middle|\, 1 \leq k < l \leq d\right\}\right\}. \tag{2.110}$$

From the above equation an the characterization of the highest weight vectors (see Fact 2.25) it follows that in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ we have two (up to a scalar factor) highest weight vectors

$$|\psi_0^+\rangle = |0\rangle \left(\text{the Fock vacuum}\right), \; |\psi_0^-\rangle = |0, \ldots, 0, 1\rangle.$$

The irreducible representations of $\text{Spin}\left(2d\right)$ corresponding to these highest weight vectors[30] are

$$\Pi_s^+ : \text{Spin}\left(2d\right) \to \text{U}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$$

and

$$\Pi_s^- : \text{Spin}\left(2d\right) \to \text{U}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^-\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$$

respectively.

[30] We define $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ as a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ spanned by states with even number of excitations. Analogously, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^{+-}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ spanned by states with odd number of excitations

3. Multilinear criteria for detection of general correlations for pure states

In this chapter we present a unified method for describing various classes of pure states that define physically interesting types of quantum correlations. The scheme, in which we define correlations for mixed states, has already been discussed in Chapter 1 but we present it here briefly for completeness. The general idea is that we start from the class of "not-correlated" pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and define non-correlated (with respect to the choice of $\mathcal{M}$) mixed states as states that can be expressed as convex mixtures of states belonging to $\mathcal{M}$. Mathematically this corresponds to taking the convex hull, $\mathcal{M}^c$, in the set of all density matrices $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$. Consequently, correlated states are defined as all mixed states that are outside $\mathcal{M}^c$.

Clearly, the so-defined concept of correlations depends upon the choice of the considered class $\mathcal{M}$. As we will see, with the appropriate choice of $\mathcal{M}$ we can capture many interesting classes of correlations in multipartite quantum systems. In the current Chapter we will address the following problem.

Problem 3.1. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be a class of non-correlated pure states. Given a pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ decide whether it belongs to $\mathcal{M}$.

Let us illustrate the above problem on a simple example. Consider a system of two qbits, $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, and let $\mathcal{M}$ consists of separable states. Let $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$, where $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ form a standard basis of $\mathbb{C}^2$. Obviously a vector $|\psi\rangle = |+\rangle|+\rangle$ defines a separable state. However, when we express it in the standard basis $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ we get

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle|0\rangle + |0\rangle|1\rangle + |1\rangle|0\rangle + |1\rangle|1\rangle) ,$$

and it is no longer obvious that $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is separable[1]. Our aim is to give a basis-independent criterion for deciding whether an arbitrary pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}$. Obviously, the solution to Problem 3.1 depends on both the class $\mathcal{M}$ and the relevant Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. In the present chapter we solve Problem 3.1 by describing the physically-interesting classes of pure states as null sets of some real homogenous polynomials defined on the relevant Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}$. This approach, at the first glance, seems to be rather abstract and high-level. Nevertheless, in latter chapters of the thesis we will show that such a characterization can be used to derive non-trivial criteria for detection of the correlations for general mixed states.

The chapter is organized as follows. In Section 3.1 we will focus on the situation when the class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ consists of "generalized coherent states" of a compact simply-connected Lie group K [26, 87, 88, 89]. In this case it is possible to characterize the class $\mathcal{M}$ as the zero set of a single K-invariant quartic (quadratic in the density matrix) polynomial. Many interesting types of correlations can be defined in this way. Examples include: entanglement of distinguishable

[1] Obviously, theory of quantum information offers us tools (Schmidt decomposition, reduction to one-body density matrices etc.) with the help of which we can solve this problem. However in general the class $\mathcal{M}$ can be very different from the class of separable states.

particles [6], entanglement in bosonic [16, 21] and fermionic [20, 21, 90] systems, as well as "non-Gaussian" correlations in fermionic systems [22, 24, 91]. In all these cases the dimension of the relevant Hilbert spaces is finite. In Section 3.2 we discuss entanglement of distinguishable particles, bosons and fermions, without the restriction on dimensions of the single particle Hilbert spaces. Also in these cases the relevant classes of pure states can be characterized as the zero sets of a single quartic polynomial. In Section 3.3 we discuss classes of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ that can be described as zeros of homogenous polynomials of degree higher than two in the density matrix. Via such homogenous polynomials we can cover all the classes mentioned above, as well as other classes that cannot be described by polynomials of too low degree. We focus on classes of pure states that give rise to a more detailed description of quantum entanglement. In the bipartite setting we describe polynomials defining the class of pure states having the Schmidt number at most n [29, 92][2]. The corresponding class of correlated states consists of mixed states with Schmidt number bigger then n. In the multipartite setting we deal with the class of "absolutely separable" pure states, i.e. states that remain separable in all possible bipartitions of the composite Hilbert space [3, 5]. States that cannot be written as convex combinations of "absolutely separable" pure states are called genuinely multipartite entangled. The chapter concludes with Section 3.4 where we summarize the obtained results and present some open problems.

The content of this chapter can be treated as an extension of works [26], [69] and [89] where authors describe classes of non-correlated pure states via a single quartic (quadratic in the density matrix) K-invariant polynomials. The presented approach has the following advantages:

- Simple and computable description of polynomials describing the relevant classes of "non-correlated" pure states discussed in [26], [89] and [69].
- Treatment of broader classes of correlations than in cases described in [26], [69] and [89] (e.g., fermionic Gaussian states).
- It uses the higher order polynomials in order to describe more complicated types of entanglement or correlations.

The results presented in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 constitute parts of the papers: [93, 94]. The results presented in Subsection 3.3 will contribute to the forthcoming paper [95].

Finally, let us mention that during the discussion of polynomial description of subsequent classes of states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ (and thus, the corresponding types of correlations) we will introduce the notation and terminology that will be used in the remaining chapters of the thesis.

3.1. Quadratic characterization of coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups

In this section we discuss the Perelomov generalized coherent states of a compact simply-connected Lie group K [26, 87, 89]. We first show, using facts from representation theory, that in this situation the set of coherent states $\mathcal{M}$ is the zero set of a single K-invariant quartic (quadratic in the density matrix) polynomial on the relevant Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. In other words the following holds,

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \langle\psi|\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,, \tag{3.1}$$

[2] We focus on the system of qdits meaning that the relevant Hilbert space is $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$. The natural number n cannot exceed $d = \max\{d_1, d_2\}$

where A is the K-invariant orthonormal projector onto some subspace of $\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}$ [3]. In the latter part of the section we will present the algebraic form of the operator A for four physically relevant classes of coherent states: product states of distinguishable particles, product bosonic states, Slater determinants (in systems with fixed number of fermions) and fermionic Gaussian states.



Figure 3.1. Pictorial representation of the expression $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle$ defining, via Eq. (3.1), class of generalized coherent states $\mathcal{M}$.

Let us define precisely the concept of generalized coherent states for compact simply-connected Lie groups [26, 88]. Let K be a compact simply-connected Lie group and let

$$\Pi{:}K \to U\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right),\ k \to \Pi\left(k\right) \tag{3.2}$$

be an irreducible representation of K characterized by the highest weight λ_0. Due to the compactness of K (see Section 2.4) the dimension of $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ is finite. Let $|\psi_0\rangle$ be a normalized highest weight vector in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$. The set of the generalized coherent states, $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_0,K}$ is defined as the orbit of K through the state $|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| \in \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_0,K} = \left\{\Pi\left(k\right)|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|\Pi\left(k\right)^\dagger \mid k \in K\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Where we have used the subscripts K and λ_0 to express the fact that the set of coherent states depends both on the group K and on its irreducible representation (labeled by λ_0). In what follows we will usually drop these subscripts for the sake of simplicity (we will be working with the fixed representation $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ of a fixed group K).

There exists a simple, purely algebraic characterization of the set $\mathcal{M}$, given by Liechtenstein [96] which we now briefly describe. Let $\pi = \Pi_*$ be the induced representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$,

$$\pi{:}\mathfrak{k} \to i\cdot\mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right),\ X \to \pi\left(X\right).$$

Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$, i.e. the complexification of some maximal torus $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{k}$ (see Section 2.4 for details). The representations Π and π can be promoted, by the usual construction (see Section 2.4), to the representation on $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$,

$$\Pi\otimes\Pi : K \to \mathrm{U}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right),\ k \to \Pi\left(k\right)\otimes\Pi\left(k\right), \tag{3.4}$$

$$\pi\otimes\pi : \mathfrak{k} \to i\cdot\mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right),\ X \to \pi\left(X\right)\otimes\mathbb{I}+\mathbb{I}\otimes\pi\left(X\right). \tag{3.5}$$

Proposition 3.1. *The representation $\Pi\otimes\Pi$ is, in general, reducible. The decomposition of $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ onto irreducible components reads,*

$$\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0}\oplus\bigoplus_{\beta<2\lambda_0}\mathcal{H}^{\beta}, \tag{3.6}$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0}$ denotes the representation characterized by the highest weight $2\lambda_0$ and $\bigoplus_{\beta<2\lambda_0}\mathcal{H}^{\beta}$ denotes the direct sum of all other irreducible subrepresentations of the group K in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$.

[3] Expression $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\otimes|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\,A\right)$ is to be understood as a degree four real polynomial on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ (or the degree two polynomial in the density matrix $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$)

Proof. It is enough to show that $2\lambda_0$ is a highest weight and that in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ there exist only one irreducible representation of K characterized by the highest weight $2\lambda_0$. This however is equivalent to showing that in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ there exist only one weight vector corresponding to the highest weight $2\lambda_0$. Let $\mathrm{wt}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0},\Pi\right)$ denotes the set of weights corresponding to weight vectors in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$. By the definition of the tensor product of representation we have

$$\mathrm{wt}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0},\Pi\otimes\Pi\right)=\left\{\lambda+\mu\;\middle|\lambda,\mu\in\mathrm{wt}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0},\Pi\right)\right\}\,. \tag{3.7}$$

From (3.7) we get that for arbitrary $\tilde{\lambda}\in\mathrm{wt}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0},\Pi\otimes\Pi\right)$ and from the definition of the highest weight (2.79) applied to the highest weight λ_0 we get

$$2\lambda_0-\tilde{\lambda}=\sum_{i=1}^{r}x_i\alpha_i\,,x_i\geq 0\,,$$

where $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{r}=\Delta$. Consequently, we by the theorem of the highest weight (c.f. Fact 2.25) and the fact that every finite-dimensional representation of K is completely reducible (c.f. Eq.(2.53)) we get that $2\lambda_0$ is a highest weight. There is only one weight vector $|\psi\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ that characterized by the weight $2\lambda_0$. Note that for $\lambda,\mu\in\mathrm{wt}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0},\Pi\right)$ we have the following implication,

$$2\lambda_0-\mu-\lambda=0\iff\lambda=\mu=\lambda_0\,.$$

which is a consequence of the fact that λ_0 is the unique highest weight in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$. As all weight vectors in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ are linear combinations of simple tensors $|\psi_\lambda\rangle|\psi_\mu\rangle$, where $|\psi_\lambda\rangle,|\psi_\mu\rangle\in\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ are weight vectors corresponding to weights $\lambda,\mu\in\mathrm{wt}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0},\Pi\right)$ we conclude that the only weight vector characterized by highest weight vector is $|\psi\rangle=|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_0\rangle$. □

Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathfrak{k})}$ be the orthonormal (with respect to the chosen Ad_K-invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{k}$) basis of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ and let $C_2=-\sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathfrak{k})}X_i^2$ be the second order Casimir operator of a semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ (see Eq. 2.80). Let L_2 denote the representation[4] of C_2 in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$

$$L_2:\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\to\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\,,\;L_2=-\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\pi\left(X_i\right)\otimes\mathbb{I}+\mathbb{I}\otimes\pi\left(X_i\right)\right)^2\,. \tag{3.8}$$

The operator L_2 commutes with $\Pi(k)\otimes\Pi(k)$ for each $k\in K$ so, by the Schur lemma, it is proportional to the identity operator on each irreducible component $\mathcal{H}^{\beta}$ in the decomposition (3.6). According to (2.81) we have

$$L_2|_{\mathcal{H}^{\beta}}=\left(\beta,\,\beta+2\delta\right)\mathbb{I}|_{\mathcal{H}^{\beta}}\,, \tag{3.9}$$

where $(\cdot,\cdot):\mathfrak{h}\times\mathfrak{h}\to\mathbb{C}$ is the Ad_K-invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{h}$ (c.f. Subsection (2.4.2)).

Fact 3.1. *([96]) The set of generalized coherent states $\mathcal{M}$ can be characterized by the following condition*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\in\mathcal{M}\iff L_2|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle=\left(2\lambda_0,\,2\lambda_0+2\delta\right)|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle\,. \tag{3.10}$$

Using (3.9) and (3.10) we get the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *The set of generalized coherent states $\mathcal{M}$ can be characterized by the following condition*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\in\mathcal{M}\iff\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}-\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}\right)|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle=0\,, \tag{3.11}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}$ is a projector onto the two-fold symmetric tensor power of $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda}$ and the operator $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}:\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\to\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ is the orthonormal projector onto the irreducible representation $\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0}\subset\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\otimes\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$.

[4] As it was noted in the Section 2.4 every representation of Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ induces the representation of the universal enveloping algebra $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{k})$ which contains C_2.

It follows that the operator $A = \mathbb{P}^{\text{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ is invariant under the action of K,

$$\Pi(k) \otimes \Pi(k) A \Pi^{\dagger}(k) \otimes \Pi^{\dagger}(k) = A\,, \text{ for all } k \in K\,. \tag{3.12}$$

Consequently, the function

$$C^2 : \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) \ni |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \to \langle\psi|\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = \text{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes 2}\right] A\right) \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

is a polynomial invariant[5] under the action of the group K. From (3.11) and (3.12) we easily conclude the criterion (3.1) presented at the beginning of this Section.

We present here, following [28], an alternative point of view on the Fact 3.1. This perspective will sheds some light on the physical interpretation of generalized coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups. Racall that due to the fact that representation Π is unitary, operators $\pi(X)$ ($X \in \mathfrak{k}$) are anti-Hermitian and do not represent physical observables. Let us therefore introduce the following notation[6]:$\bar{\pi}(X) = i\pi(X)$. Let us consider now the generalized variance, $\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$, of a state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ defined by

$$\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathfrak{k})} \left(\langle\psi|\bar{\pi}(X_i)^2\,\psi\rangle - \langle\psi|\bar{\pi}(X_i)\,\psi\rangle^2\right), \tag{3.13}$$

where elements of $X_i \in \mathfrak{k}$ are defined as in (3.8). One can think of $\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ as of the generalized measure of uncertainty associated to a state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$while measuring Hermitian operators which are representatives of the orthonormal basis of $\mathfrak{k}$. The variance $\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ can be expressed via the expectation value of the Casimir L_2,

$$\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = (\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + 2\delta) - \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathfrak{k})} \langle\psi|\bar{\pi}(X_i)\,\psi\rangle^2\,, \tag{3.14}$$

$$= 2(\lambda_0, \lambda_0 + 2\delta) - \frac{1}{2}\langle\psi|\langle\psi|L_2|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle\,. \tag{3.15}$$

In the above the first line follows from the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathfrak{k})} \bar{\pi}(X_i)^2$ is the representation of the Casimir in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$. The second line is a consequence of (3.8). From (3.15) we see that $\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ is invariant under the action of the group K,

$$\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \text{Var}_K\left(\Pi(k)\,|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\Pi(k)^{\dagger}\right)\,.$$

Fact 3.1 can be now deduced from the following fact which characterizes coherent states as states that minimize the variance $\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$.

Fact 3.2. *Let* $\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ *be the generalized* K*-invariant variance defined above. The following equality holds*

$$\min_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)} \text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = (\lambda_0, 2\delta)\,. \tag{3.16}$$

Moreover, $\text{Var}_K(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = (\lambda_0, 2\delta)$ *if and only if* $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \Pi(k)\,|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|\Pi(k)^{\dagger}$*, for* $k \in K$*.*

[5] Function C^2 is an example of a polynomial invariant of the action of the group K in $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$. For the comprehensive study of application of invariant polynomials in the context of entanglement see [33].

[6] It is necessary to introduce the additional imaginary unit factor due to the fact that throughout the thesis we decided to use a "mathematical" definition of a Lie algebra.

From the above fact we have

$$\max_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\in\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0})} \langle\psi|\langle\psi|L_2|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = (2\lambda_0,\, 2\lambda_0 + 2\delta)\ , \tag{3.17}$$

and $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|L_2|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = (2\lambda_0,\, 2\lambda_0 + 2\delta)$ if and only if $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is a coherent state.

We now apply (3.11) to describe, by a single polynomial condition, four physically-relevant classes of pure states:

- Product states,
- Symmetric product states
- Slater determinants
- Pure fermionic Gaussian states.

Motivation for the study of above listed classes of states was presented in Section 1. As we present the polynomial characterization of these classes we will introduce the necessary notation and group-theoretical formalism needed for the description of these classes them (that will be used also in other parts of the thesis). Results presenting the polynomial characterization of each class of states are stated in the form of lemmas whose proofs can be omitted without affecting the understanding of the rest of the thesis.

3.1.1. Product states (non-entangled pure states)

In the case of L distinguishable particles, the Hilbert space of states is the tensor product of the Hilbert spaces of single particles $\mathcal{H}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_L$ of dimensions $N_1, \ldots, N_L$, which we conveniently identify with the complex spaces of the same dimensions,

$$\mathcal{H}_d = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_L = \mathbb{C}^{N_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{N_L} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathbb{C}^{N_i}\,. \tag{3.18}$$

We take the group K as the group of local unitary operations i.e as the direct product of special unitary groups $SU(N_k)$, each acting independently in the respective one-particle space $\mathcal{H}_k = \mathbb{C}^{N_k}$[7]. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} K = \mathrm{LU} = \mathrm{SU}(N_1) \times \ldots \times \mathrm{SU}\,(N_L) = \times_{i=1}^{L} SU(N_i)\,, \\ \Pi_d(U_1 \ldots, U_L)|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_L\rangle = U_1|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes U_L|\psi_L\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

In the notation above we made explicit that the group K acts on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_d$ via the particular representation Π_d, defined here by its action on simple tensors. Representation Π_d is a tensor product of the defining (and thus irreducible) representations of groups $\mathrm{SU}\,(N_i)$. From the Fact (2.13) it follows that the representation Π_d is actually irreducible. One easily checks that in this case generalized coherent states are precisely product states,

$$\mathcal{M}_d = \{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1\,(\mathcal{H}_d)\,|\,|\psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle \ldots |\psi_L\rangle,\ |\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_i\}\ . \tag{3.20}$$

We now describe explicitly the operator A that defines, via (3.11), the set $\mathcal{M}_d$. Let us first introduce some notation:

$$\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} \mathcal{H}_i\right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i=1'}^{i=L'} \mathcal{H}_i\right)\ , \tag{3.21}$$



Figure 3.2. Graphical illustration of the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ for $L = 5$. Note that $\mathcal{H}_i \approx \mathcal{H}_{i'}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, L$

where $L = L'$ and we decided to label spaces from the second copy of the total space with primes in order to avoid ambiguity.

The action of K on $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H}_d)$ is given by the restriction to the symmetric (with respect to the interchange of copies of $\mathcal{H}_d$) tensors of the action defined on $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ (Eq. (3.4)). Let us also introduce the symmetrization operators $\mathbb{P}^+_{ii'} : \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d \to \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ that project onto the subspace of $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ completely symmetric under interchange spaces labeled by i and i' (the operators of anti-symmetrization $\mathbb{P}^-_{ii'}$ are defined analogously).

Lemma 3.1. *Under the introduced notation the closed expression for the projector operator* $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ *(see* (3.11)*) for the case of* $K = \times^L\big(\mathrm{SU}(N)\big)$ *and* $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_d$ *reads*

$$\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0} = \mathbb{P}_d = \mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'} \,. \tag{3.22}$$

Consequently, by the virtue of (3.11) *we have the following characterization of the set of product states*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_{dist} \iff C^2_{dist}\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right) = \langle\psi|\langle\psi|\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}\right)|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0 \,. \tag{3.23}$$



Figure 3.3. Graphical illustration he action of the operator $\mathbb{P}_d$ in $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$. Red circles correspond to symmetrizations in the relevant factors of the space $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. The proof of (3.22) is the following. First, notice that for separable $|\psi\rangle$ we have $\mathbb{P}_d|\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$. Secondly, we have the equivalence of representations of K,

$$\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H}_d)\right) \approx \mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H}_1) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H}_2) \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H}_L) \,.$$

Therefore, subspace $\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H}_d)\right)$ is an irreducible representation of K. Talking into account criterion (3.11) and the fact that the separable states are exactly the coherent states of K finishes the proof. □

[7] As a group of local unitary transformations we could have also taken can take the group $K' = \mathrm{U}(N_1) \times \ldots \times \mathrm{U}(N_L)$. However, for physical applications the global phase of the wave function does not play a role and hence the distinction between K and K' is irrelevant.

3.1.2. Symmetric product states (non-entangled pure states of bosons)

The Hilbert space describing L bosonic particles in N modes has the structure $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_b = \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{H} \approx \mathbb{C}^N$ is the single particle Hilbert space. The relevant symmetry group is a compact simply-connected Lie group $K = \mathrm{SU}(N)$ represented on $\mathcal{H}_b$ via the irreducible representation Π_b describing an arbitrary "single-particle" evolution

$$\Pi_b(U)\left(|\psi_1\rangle \vee \cdots \vee |\psi_L\rangle\right) = U|\psi_1\rangle \vee \cdots \vee U|\psi_L\rangle, \tag{3.24}$$

where $|\psi_1\rangle \vee \cdots \vee |\psi_L\rangle$ denotes the (normalized) projection onto $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$ of the vector[8] $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_L\rangle$. In the notation for the highest weights of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ introduced in Subsection (2.4.3), the representation Π_b is labeled by the highest weight $\lambda_0 = (L, 0, \ldots, 0)$. The set of generalized coherent states coincides with the set of symmetric product states,

$$\mathcal{M}_b = \left\{ |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_b) \mid |\psi\rangle = |\phi\rangle|\phi\rangle \ldots |\phi\rangle\,,\ |\phi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^N \right\}. \tag{3.25}$$

We proceed with giving the explicit form of the operator A describing $\mathcal{M}_b$. We first embed $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$ in the Hilbert space of L identical distinguishable particles,

$$\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_L\,, \tag{3.26}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_i \approx \mathcal{H}$. We have the analogous embedding of $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \vee \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \vee \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \subset \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} \mathcal{H}_i\right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i=1'}^{i=L'} \mathcal{H}_i\right) = \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d\,,$$

where, as before, $L = L'$. Let $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} : \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d \to \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ be the projector onto the subspace of $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ which is completely symmetric with respect to the interchange of spaces labeled by indices from the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$. We define $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}$ in the analogous way.

Lemma 3.2. *Under the introduced notation a closed expression for the projector operator $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ (see (3.11)) for the case of $K = \mathrm{SU}(N)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_b$ reads*

$$\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0} = \mathbb{P}_b = \left(\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}\right)\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right), \tag{3.27}$$

The operators $\mathbb{P}^+_{ii'}$ are the same as in (3.22) and it is understood that $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ acts on the space $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$. By (3.11) we have the following characterization of the set of product bosonic states

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_b \iff C_b^2(|\psi\rangle) = \langle\psi|\langle\psi|\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}_b\right)|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,. \tag{3.28}$$

Before we prove Lemma 3.2 let us note that we may write

$$\mathbb{P}_b|_{\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})\otimes\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})} = \mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}\,,$$

as for any $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$ we have $\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right)|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. We show that the operator $\mathbb{P}_b : \bigotimes^{2L}\mathcal{H} \to \bigotimes^{2L}\mathcal{H}$, given by

$$\mathbb{P}_b = \left(\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}\right)\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right),$$

equals $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$. Notice that $\mathbb{P}_b\left(\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \vee \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})\right) \subset \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \vee \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, $\mathbb{P}_b$ is a projector onto $\mathrm{Sym}^{2L}(\mathcal{H})$, a completely symmetric subspace of $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$. Subspace $\mathrm{Sym}^{2L}(\mathcal{H})$ is an irreducible representation of K labeled by the highest weight $\lambda_0 = (2L, 0, \ldots, 0)$. For a coherent bosonic state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_b$, we have $\mathbb{P}_b|\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$. As a result, by criterion (3.11), $\mathbb{P}_b = \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$. □

[8] It is clear that vectors of the form $|\psi_1\rangle \vee \cdots \vee |\psi_L\rangle$ span $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$.



Figure 3.4. Graphical illustration of the action of the operator $\mathbb{P}_b$ in $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$. Red circles correspond to symmetrizations in the relevant factors of the space $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$.

3.1.3. Slater determinants

The Hilbert space describing L fermionic particles in N modes is[9] $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_f = \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{H} \approx \mathbb{C}^N$ (obviously we have to assume that $L \leq N$). As a symmetry group we take again $K = \mathrm{SU}(N)$. The group K is represented on $\mathcal{H}_f$ via the irreducible representation Π_f, describing an arbitrary "single-particle" evolution,

$$\Pi_f(U)\left(|\psi_1\rangle \wedge \cdots \wedge |\psi_L\rangle\right) = U|\psi_1\rangle \wedge \cdots \wedge U|\psi_L\rangle, \tag{3.29}$$

where $|\psi_1\rangle \wedge \cdots \wedge |\psi_L\rangle$ denotes the projection onto $\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$ of the vector $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_L\rangle$ (it is clear that vectors of the form $|\psi_1\rangle \wedge \cdots \wedge |\psi_L\rangle$ span $\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$). The representation Π_f is characterized by the highest weight

$$\lambda_0 = \left(\overbrace{1, \ldots, 1}^{L}, 0, \ldots, 0\right) .$$

The set of generalized coherent states coincides with the set consisting of projectors onto Slater determinants,

$$\mathcal{M}_f = \left\{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_f) \;|\; |\psi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \wedge |\phi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\phi_L\rangle,\, |\phi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^N,\, \langle\phi_i|\phi_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}\right\} . \tag{3.30}$$

This time the explicit computation of the operator A describing the set $\mathcal{M}_f$ in a bit more complicated but nevertheless can be done analytically. Just like in the case of bosons (see (3.26)) we have

$$\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_L,\; \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}) \vee \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}) \subset \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} \mathcal{H}_i\right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i=1'}^{i=L'} \mathcal{H}_i\right) = \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d\,. \tag{3.31}$$

By $\mathbb{P}^{asym}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} : \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d \to \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ we denote the projector onto the subspace of $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ which is completely asymmetric with respect to interchange of spaces labeled by indices from the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$. We define $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}$ in the analogous way.

Lemma 3.3. *Under the introduced notation a closed expression for the projector operator* $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ *(see* (3.11)*) for the case of* $K = \mathrm{SU}(N)$ *and* $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_f$ *reads*

$$\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0} = \mathbb{P}_f = \alpha\left(\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}\right)\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right) , \tag{3.32}$$

where $\alpha = \frac{2^L}{L+1}$ *and it is understood that* $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ *acts on the space* $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$*. By* (3.11) *we have the following characterization of the set of projectors onto Slater determinants*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_f \iff C^2_f(|\psi\rangle) = \langle\psi|\langle\psi|\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}_f\right)|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,. \tag{3.33}$$

[9] By $\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$ we denote the L-fold anti-symmetrization of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

In analogy to the case of bosons we have

$$\mathbb{P}_f|_{\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})\otimes\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})} = \alpha \mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'} ,$$

since for any $|\Psi\rangle \in \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$ we have $\left(\mathbb{P}^{asym}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{asym}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right)|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle$.



Figure 3.5. Graphical illustration he action of the operator $\mathbb{P}_f$. Red circles correspond to symmetrization in the relevant factors of the space $\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$. Blue rectangles enclose factors on which we have antisymmetrization.

Proof. The proof is presented in Section 8.1 of the Appendix (see page 157). □

3.1.4. Physical interpretation of the invariant polynomial for distinguishable particles, bosons and fermions

Expressions for the invariant polynomial $C^2(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \langle\psi|\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle$ that detects coherent states (in a sense of 3.1) depend, in the case of distinguishable particles, bosons and fermions, only upon $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle$ (see Eq. (3.23), (3.28) and (3.33)). One can show (c.f. [97]) that for arbitrary L-particle states the following expression holds,

$$\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 2^{-L}\left(\sum_k \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_k^2\right) + 2\right) , \tag{3.34}$$

where the summation is over all different $2^L - 2$ proper subsystems of L-particle systems and ρ_k is the reduced density matrix describing the particular subsystem k. Notice that the expression (3.34) is also valid for bosons and fermions because we can formally embed bosonic and fermionic Hilbert spaces in $\bigotimes^L\left(\mathbb{C}^N\right)$.

Although in our approach we cared only whether a given multiparty pure state is "classical" or not, it is tempting to ask what are the "maximally entangled" states corresponding to measures C^2_{dist}, C^2_b and C^2_f in each of three considered contexts. Equation (3.34) enables us to formally answer this question. Clearly, C^2_{dist}, C^2_b and C^2_f will be maximal once for each proper subsystem k the corresponding reduced density matrix will be maximally mixed. For the case of distinguishable particles states $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ satisfying this condition are called "absolutely maximally entangled states". The problem of deciding whether for a given L and N such states at all exist is in general unsolved [98]. Therefore, one cannot hope for an easy characterization of states that maximize C^2_{dist}, C^2_b or C^2_f (or equivalently, minimize (3.34) once $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{dist}$, $\mathcal{H}_b$ or $\mathcal{H}_f$ respectively). Nevertheless, the characterization of "absolutely maximally entangled" bosonic and fermionic states is certainly an interesting open problem.

Let us mention also the connection of the polynomials C^2_{dist}, C^2_b and C^2_f to the results known before. In the case of distinguishable particles the function $C_{dist}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ coincides with the multiparty concurrence considered before in [67, 68]. In these papers the authors derived

lower bounds for the convex roof extension of $C_{dist}\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right)$, which is the faithful indicator of entanglement for mixed states[10] Polynomials C_b^2 and C_f^2 were also derived in [89] for the case of $L = 2$ particles.

3.1.5. Pure Fermionic Gaussian states

The discussion of the case of pure fermionic Gaussian states needs to be preceded by a more thorough introduction then the cases considered before in this section. The reason for this is a rather involved definition of the class of fermionic Gaussian states. Because of that, despite the extensive use of fermionic Gaussian states in physics (see Section 1.1 and Section 4.2) their group-theoretical interpretation is not well-known. It is perhaps worth mentioning that in the mathematical literature pure fermionic Gaussian states are referred to as "pure spinors" [99, 100]. This subsection is organized as follows. We first present the setting and notation necessary to define pure Fermionic Gaussian states. Then we will give standard "physical" definitions of general (mixed and pure) Fermionic Gaussian states. We then show that pure fermionic Gaussian states, of d mode fermionic system can be identified with the Perelomov coherent states[11] of the of the group $\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$ in its spinor representations[12]. In the next part of we give (using results of a recent paper of de Melo, Ćwikliński and Terhal [22]) an explicit form of the operator A that allows to characterize the set of pure Gaussian states, denoted by $\mathcal{G}$, via Eq.(3.11), as a zero set of a polynomial invariant under the group of Bogolyubov transformations. Finally, due to the group-theoretical characterization of pure Gaussian states, the results concerning the operator A presented in [22] can be understood from the perspective of a general framework introduced in this Section.

Let us consider a fermionic system whose particles can be in d modes. If there is no restriction for the number of particles the relevant Hilbert space associated to a system is the fermionic Fock space which we denote $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. Mathematically $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{d} \bigwedge^{k} \left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) ,$$

where $\bigwedge^0 \left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ is a one dimensional space spanned by the Fock vacuum which we denote by $|0\rangle$. To every choice of the orthonormal basis $\{|\phi_k\rangle\}_{k=1}^{k=d}$ of the single-particle Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^d$ one associates the standard creation and annihilation operators: $a_k^\dagger$, a_k, $k = 1, \ldots, d$, satisfying canonical anticommutation relations,

$$\left\{a_k, a_l^\dagger\right\} = \delta_{kl}\mathbb{I}\,, \tag{3.35}$$

where $k, l = 1, \ldots, d$ and $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ denotes the standard anticommutator of operators, $\{A, B\} = AB+BA$. The Fock space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ has dimension 2^d and is spanned by the set of orthonormal Fock states:

$$|n_1, \ldots, n_d\rangle = \left(a_1^\dagger\right)^{n_1} \cdots \left(a_d^\dagger\right)^{n_d} |0\rangle\,, \tag{3.36}$$

where $n_k = 0, 1$, $k = 1, \ldots, d$, are the occupation numbers of the modes characterized by the single particle states $|\phi_k\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d$. For each $k = 1, \ldots, d$ the operator of the particle number in

[10] For the definition of the convex roof extension of a function see Subsection 4.1.1.

[11] Strictly speaking pure Gaussian states will be identified with the disjoint union of the coherent states of $\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$ in the direct sum of two irreducible representations.

[12] The group $\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$ is a compact simply-connected Lie group (see Subsection (2.4.4)) which is isomorphic to the group of above-mentioned Bogolyubov transformations.

the mode k is given by $\hat{n}_k = a_k^\dagger a_k$. Due to the fact that Fock states (3.36) form a basis of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$, every linear operator $A \in \text{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ can be written as a polynomial in the creation and annihilation operators.

It will be convenient to describe fermionic Gaussian states via so-called Majorana fermion operators [22, 23],

$$c_{2k-1} = a_k + a_k^\dagger\,,\; c_{2k} = i\left(a_k - a_k^\dagger\right)\,,$$

$k = 1, \ldots, d$. Majorana operators are Hermitian, traceless and satisfy the following anticommutation relations,

$$\{c_k,\, c_l\} = 2\delta_{kl}\,, \tag{3.37}$$

where $k, l = 1, \ldots, d$. Because creation and annihilation operators can be expressed uniquely via the Majorana operators every operator $X \in \text{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ can be written as a polynomial in $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^d$ [13],

$$X = \alpha_0 \mathbb{I} + \sum_{k=1}^{2d} \sum_{1<l_1<l_2<\ldots<l_k\leq 2d} \alpha_{l_1 l_2 \ldots l_k} c_{l_1} c_{l_2} \ldots c_{l_k}\,, \tag{3.38}$$

where coefficients α_0 and $\alpha_{l_1 l_2 \ldots l_k}$ are in general complex. It what follows we will consider only *even* operators, i.e. operators commuting with the total parity operator[14]

$$Q = \prod_{k=1}^{d} (-1)^{\hat{n}_k} = \prod_{k=1}^{d}\left(\mathbb{I} - 2a_k^\dagger a_k\right) = i^d \prod_{k=1}^{2d} c_k\,. \tag{3.39}$$

The operator Q has the eigenvalues ± 1 and the whole Fock space decomposes onto manually orthogonal eigenspaces of Q,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) = \mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \oplus \mathcal{H}^-_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\,, \tag{3.40}$$

where $\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ and $\mathcal{H}^-_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ are spanned by states with respectively even and odd number of excitations. The corresponding orthonormal projectors onto these subspaces are $\mathbb{P}_\pm = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{I} \pm Q\right)$. Even operators $\text{End}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ form a subalgebra of $\text{End}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ that respect the direct sum (3.40),

$$\text{End}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right) = \text{End}\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right) \oplus \text{End}\left(\mathcal{H}^-_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)\,. \tag{3.41}$$

Application of the anticommutation relations (3.37) and (3.38) shows that X is even if and only if it can be written as a polynomial in Majorana operators involving only monomials of even degree,

$$X = \alpha_0 \mathbb{I} + \sum_{k=1}^{d} i^k \sum_{1\leq l_1<l_2<\ldots<l_{2k}\leq 2d} \alpha_{l_1 l_2 \ldots l_{2k}} c_{l_1} c_{l_2} \ldots c_{l_{2k}}\,, \tag{3.42}$$

where all the coefficients α_0 and $\alpha_{l_1 l_2 \ldots l_{2k}}$ are real. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ denote the set of even mixed states on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. For an even mixed state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ the correlation matrix $M(\rho) = [M_{kl}(\rho)]$ is defined by

$$M_{kl}(\rho) = \frac{i}{2}\text{Tr}\left(\rho\,[c_k,\, c_l]\right)\,,\; k, l = 1, \ldots, 2d\,. \tag{3.43}$$

[13] One can show that the complex algebra generated by polynomials in Majorana operators is isomorphic with the complex Clifford algebra $Cl(2d, \mathbb{C})$ (*see Subsection 2.4.4*).

[14] This requirement can be understood as a kind of a superselection rule imposed on a system in question [101].

One checks that $M(\rho)$ is real and antisymmetric and therefore (see Eq.(2.42)) can be considered as an element of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(2d)$. The general Gaussian states, denoted by $Gauss \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$, are defined as states $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ of the form

$$\rho = K \cdot \exp\left(i \sum_{k \neq l} h_{kl} c_k c_l\right), \tag{3.44}$$

where the $2d \times 2d$ matrix $h = [h_{kl}]$ is real and antisymmetric ($h \in \mathfrak{so}(2d)$) and K is the normalization constant. By virtue of the fermionic Wick theorem [17, 23] Gaussian states are fully determined by their correlation matrix M. The correlation matrix of a Gaussian state ρ satisfies (see [22, 23])

$$M(\rho) M(\rho)^T \leq \mathbb{I}_{2d},$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{2d}$ is the $2d \times 2d$ identity matrix. Our main object of interest are pure fermionic Gaussian states, which we denote by $\mathcal{M}_g$. By the virtue of the following fact the class $\mathcal{M}_g$ is effectively characterized by orthogonal correlation matrices.

Fact 3.3. *[22] The class of pure fermionic Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g$ consists precisely of states $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ that have orthogonal correlation matrix.*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_g \iff M(\rho) M(\rho)^T = \mathbb{I}_{2d}. \tag{3.45}$$

We now introduce an important symmetry group acting on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ called the group of Bogolyubov transformations and denoted by $\mathcal{B}$. The group $\mathcal{B}$ is generated by arbitrary Hamiltonians quadratic in the creation and annihilation operators

$$H = i \sum_{k,l=1}^{2d} H_{kl} c_k c_l,$$

where the matrix $H = [H_{kl}]$ is real and antisymmetric. In other words we have

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ U \in \mathrm{U}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right) \mid U = \exp\left(i\left(i \sum_{k \neq l} H_{kl} c_k c_l\right)\right) \right\}. \tag{3.46}$$

The class of unitary operations $\mathcal{B}$ is also called sometimes Fermionic Linear Optics [23, 91, 22]. Elements of $\mathcal{B}$ commute with the operator of total parity Q (Eq.(3.39)). Rigorously speaking in Eq.(3.46) we should have taken as $\mathcal{B}$ the closure (with respect to, say, the norm topology in $\mathrm{U}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$) of the set consisting of finite products of operators of the form $\exp(iH)$. However one can show that due to the simple-connectedness and compactness of the group $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$ (see Subsection 2.4.4) that these two definitions of $\mathcal{B}$ coincide. Moreover, directly from the definition of $\mathcal{B}$ we get that for $U \in \mathcal{B}$ the following properties hold

$$\begin{aligned} U c_l U^\dagger &= \sum_{k=1}^{2d} R_{kl}(U) c_k, \\ M\left(U \rho U^\dagger\right) &= R(U) M(\rho) R(U)^T, \end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

where $R(U) \in \mathrm{SO}(2d)$. Moreover, the mapping $U \to R(U)$ is surjective, i.e. every special orthogonal transformation can appear in (3.47) for a suitable choice of $U \in \mathcal{B}$. In Subsection 2.4.4 it was shown that the group of Bogolyubov transformations $\mathcal{B}$ can be realized as a spinor representation of the group $\mathrm{Spin}(2d)$. To be more precise we have $\mathcal{B} = \Pi_s(\mathrm{Spin}(2d))$, where

$\Pi_s : \mathrm{Spin}\,(2d) \to \mathrm{U}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ is a so-called spinor representation of $\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$ (see Subsection 2.4.4 for more details). The spinor representation is reducible and decomposes onto two irreducible components corresponding to subspaces of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ spanned by the Fock states with respectively even and odd number of excitations,

$$\Pi_s = \Pi_s^+ \oplus \Pi_s^- \,, \tag{3.48}$$

where

$$\Pi_s^\pm : \mathrm{Spin}\,(2d) \to \mathrm{U}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right) \,.$$

are representations described in detail in Subsection 2.4.4. Note that Eq.(3.48) is in agreement with the observation that $\mathcal{B}$ commutes with the total parity operator. The pure fermionic Gaussian states are closely related to coherent states of $\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$ in representations $\Pi_s^\pm$ as specified in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ be the class of pure fermionic Gaussian states defined as above. Let $|\psi_0^\pm\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ be some fixed highest weight vectors*[15] *of the representations $\Pi_s^\pm$. Let $\mathcal{M}_g^\pm \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ be the orbits of $\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$ through the states*

$$|\psi_0^\pm\rangle\langle\psi_0^\pm| \in \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right) \,.$$

Then,

$$\mathcal{M}_g = \mathcal{M}_g^+ \cup \mathcal{M}_g^- \,, \tag{3.49}$$

where elements of $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ and $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^-\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ are treated as elements of $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ in a natural manner by the virtue of the decomposition (3.40).

Proof. We present the proof of Proposition 3.3 in Section 8.1 of the Appendix (see page 159). □

The graphical representation of Eq.(3.49) is presented on Figure 3.6.



Figure 3.6. Graphical representation of the relation $\mathcal{M}_g = \mathcal{M}_g^+ \cup \mathcal{M}_g^-$, $\mathcal{M}_g^+ \cap \mathcal{M}_g^- = \emptyset$.

We now present, after [22, 23], the characterization of pure fermionic Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g$ as the null set of the $\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$-invariant polynomial defined via the projector A acting on $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ (c.f. Eq.(3.11)). This characterization is completely analogous to the one presented previously in this section. The only difference comes from the fact that the relevant

[15] Without the loss of generality we can take $|\psi_0^+\rangle = |0\rangle$ (Fock vacuum) and $|\psi_0^-\rangle = |0, 0, \ldots, 1\rangle$ (excitation only in the last mode $|\phi_1\rangle$).

representation of the symmetry group Π_s is reducible and decomposes onto two irreducible representations. Let us define the operator $\Lambda \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$

$$\Lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{2d} c_i \otimes c_i \,. \tag{3.50}$$

A straightforward computation shows that Λ is $\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$-invariant, i.e.

$$\left[\Pi_s\left(g\right) \otimes \Pi_s\left(g\right), \Lambda\right] = 0$$

for all $g \in \mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$.

Fact 3.4. *([22, 23]) Let $\mathbb{P}_0$ denotes the projector onto the null eigenspace of the operator Λ. Then, the following equivalence holds*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_g \iff \left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}_0\right)|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,. \tag{3.51}$$

The projector $A = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}_0$ is manifestly $\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)$-invariant. The following proposition presents $\mathbb{P}_0$ directly in terms of Majorana operators.

Proposition 3.4. . *The closed-form expression for $\mathbb{P}_0$, the projector onto the null eigenspace of Λ (see Eq.(3.50)), in terms of the Majorana operators reads*

$$\mathbb{P}_0 = \frac{1}{2^{2d}} \sum_{k=0}^{d} f_{k,d} \left(\sum_{\substack{X \subset \{1,\ldots,2d\} \\ |X| = 2k}} \prod_{i \in X} c_i \otimes c_i \right), \tag{3.52}$$

where the inner summation is over all subsets X of the set $\{1,\ldots,2d\}$ with the cardinality $|X| = 2k$ and

$$f_{k,d} = (-1)^k \frac{(2k)!\,(2d-2k)!}{d!k!\,(d-k)!}\,. \tag{3.53}$$

Proof. The proof is given in Section 8.1 of the Appendix (see page 159). □

Remark. The projectors $\mathbb{P}_{\pm}^{2\lambda_0}$ (appearing in Eq.(3.11)) associated to representations $\Pi_s^{\pm}$ can be obtained from $\mathbb{P}_0$ by restricting it to the subspaces $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^{\pm}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^{\pm}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$.

3.2. Quadratic characterization of the generalized coherent states in the infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces

In this section we provide polynomials that detect correlations of pure quantum states when dimensions of the relevant Hilbert spaces are infinite. We will cover the following types of correlations, defined by the suitable choice of the class of "non-correlated" pure states $\mathcal{M}$ (as explained in Section 1 and in the beginning of this chapter).

- Entanglement in system of distinguishable particles; $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_d$ - pure product states;
- Entanglement in system of finite number of bosons; $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_b$ - symmetric product states;
- "Entanglement" in system of finite number of fermions; $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_f$ - symmetric product states;

The section is organized as follows. We first make a few technical remarks about infinite dimensional setting. In the rest of the section we prove that the criteria for correlations are given by formally the same expressions is in the finite dimensional case (see Equations (3.23), (3.28) and (3.33)).

A separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is, by definition, a Hilbert space in which it is possible to chose a countable basis. Almost all Hilbert spaces that occur in physics are separable [58]. Examples include all finite dimensional Hilbert spaces or the space space of square integrable (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^d, dx\right)$. In this section we consider only separable Hilbert spaces. The space of pure states of a quantum system is a set $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ consisting of rank one orthogonal projectors acting on $\mathcal{H}$, i.e. operators that project orthogonally onto one dimensional subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$. The space $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a metric space with respect to the Hilbert–Schmidt metric [58]. That is, for $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, |\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ we have

$$\mathrm{d}\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi||\phi\rangle\langle\phi|\right) = \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}\left[\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| - |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|\right)^2\right]} = \sqrt{2\left(1 - |\langle\psi|\phi\rangle|^2\right)}\,, \tag{3.54}$$

where $\mathrm{d}(\cdot,\,\cdot)$ denotes the metric.

Proposition 3.5. *The set of pure states $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ endowed with the metric (3.54) is a complete metric space, i.e. every Cauchy sequence of elements from $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ converges.*

Proof. We will use the proof of this proposition to briefly introduce the notion of Hilbert-Schmidt operators. A bounded operator[16] A is a Hilbert Schmidt-operator if and only if for some basis $\{|e_i\rangle\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \|A|e_i\rangle\|^2 < \infty\,.$$

The space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators $\mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H})$ is a Hilbert space itself when equipped with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathrm{HS}}$ defined in the following way

$$\langle A, B\rangle_{\mathrm{HS}} = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \langle e_i|A^*B|e_i\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left(A^*B\right)\,, \tag{3.55}$$

where, as above, $\{|e_i\rangle\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{H}$, and A^* denotes the adjoint of the operator A. The Hilbert-Schmidt inner product induces a trace distance between elements of $A, B \in \mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H})$

$$\|A - B\| = \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}\left[(A-B)^2\right]}\,. \tag{3.56}$$

Simple calculation shows that the metric (3.54) is a restriction of the trace distance to $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ (rank one projectors on $\mathcal{H}$). The completeness of $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ follows from the fact $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is a closed subset of Hilbert of $\mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H})$ (endowed with the trace distance (3.56)). The set of pure states $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is closed in $\mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H})$ because it is specified uniquely by the following conditions

$$\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}) \iff \mathbb{P}^2 = \mathbb{P}\,,\, \mathbb{P}^* = \mathbb{P} \,\text{and}\, \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{P}\right)\!=\!1\,. \tag{3.57}$$

Mappings

$$\mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H})\,,\; A \to A^2 - A\,,$$
$$\mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H})\,,\,,\, A \to A - A^*\,,$$
$$\mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{C}\,,\; A \to \mathrm{tr}\left(A\right)\,,$$

are manifestly continuous (with respect to the trace distance (3.56)) and thus the set $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is the intersection of closed subsets of $\mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H})$ and therefore is a closed subset of $\mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H})$. □

[16] The set of bounded (continuous) operators on $\mathcal{H}$ is consists of operators $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ that satisfy $\|A|v\rangle\| \leq C\,\||v\rangle\|$ for some $C \geq 0$ and all $|v\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$.

3.2.1. Distinguishable particles

We first study entanglement of L distinguishable particles, described by the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_d = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} \mathcal{H}_i$, where single particle Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_i$ are in general infinite dimensional. The notion of the tensor product of infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces involves, by definition, taking into account tensors having infinite rank, i.e. tensors that cannot be written as a finite combination of elements of the form $|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle \ldots |\psi_L\rangle$. This phenomenon, which is the main obstacle when we want to extend finite-dimensional results to the infinite-dimensional setting, does not occur when dimensions of single particle Hilbert spaces are finite. The set of product states consists, as before, of states having the form of simple tensors from $\mathcal{H}_d$,

$$\mathcal{M}_d = \{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_d) \,|\, |\psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle \ldots |\psi_L\rangle,\ |\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_i\}\ . \tag{3.58}$$

One can identify $\mathcal{M}_d$ with the orbit of $K = \mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H}_1)\times\mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H}_2)\times\ldots\times\mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H}_L)$ through one exemplary separable state $|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$. The main difference with the finite dimensional setting is that the group K is not a Lie group, not to mention it is compact. Therefore, methods of representation theory of Lie group cannot be applied to get result of the form (3.23). Nevertheless, we argue that the result analogous to (3.23) indeed holds.

Lemma 3.4. *We have the following characterization of product states defined on a general separable composite Hilbert space* $\mathcal{H}_d = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} \mathcal{H}_i$

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_d \Longleftrightarrow C_d^2(|\psi\rangle) = \langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,, \tag{3.59}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^+_{ii'} : \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d \to \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$ *are the symmetrization operators defined as under Eq.* (3.21).

Proof of Lemma (3.4). In order to prove (3.59) we first observe that $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{P}^+_{11'}\circ\mathbb{P}^+_{22'}\circ\ldots\circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0$ for separable states. Therefore, we only need to prove the inverse implication. Let us denote by $\mathcal{M}_d^i$ the set of states that are separable with respect to the bipartition $\mathcal{H}_d = \mathcal{H}_i \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j\neq i} \mathcal{H}_j\right)$. That is,

$$\mathcal{M}_d^i = \left\{ |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_d)|\ |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_i\,,\ |\phi\rangle \in \left(\bigotimes_{j\neq i} \mathcal{H}_j\right) \right\}. \tag{3.60}$$

One checks that $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_d$ if and only if $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_d^i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, L$ (in other words $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is separable with respect to any bipartition $\mathcal{H}_d = \mathcal{H}_i \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j\neq i} \mathcal{H}_j\right)$). Note that in order not to complicate the notation we abuse the notation of the tensor product in (3.60) (we do not respect the order of terms in the tensor product). The proof of the above statement is straightforward. If $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_d^i$, then $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenvector (with eigenvalue 1) of the operator

$$|\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i| \otimes \mathbb{I}_i, \tag{3.61}$$

where $|\phi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_i$ and $\mathbb{I}_i$ is the identity operator on $\left(\bigotimes_{j\neq i} \mathcal{H}_j\right)$. Note that we can repeat the above reasoning for all other $i = 1, \ldots, L$. As a result, we get that $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenvector with the eigenvalue 1 of the operator

$$\mathbb{P} = |\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1| \otimes |\phi_2\rangle\langle\phi_2| \otimes \ldots \otimes |\phi_L\rangle\langle\phi_L|,$$

where $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_i$. Operator $\mathbb{P}$ is a projector onto a separable state and we must have $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \mathbb{P}$.

We can now prove that $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{P}^+_{11'}\otimes\mathbb{P}^+_{22'}\otimes\ldots\otimes\mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0$ implies that $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is a product states. Assume that $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is entangled. By the discussion above it must be

non-separable with respect to some bipartition $\mathcal{H}_{i_0} \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j\neq i_0} \mathcal{H}_j\right)$. We write the Schmidt decomposition of $|\psi\rangle$ with respect to this bipartition [102],

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_l \lambda_l |\psi_l\rangle \otimes |\phi_l\rangle, \tag{3.62}$$

where $|\psi_l\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{i_0}$, $|\phi_l\rangle \in \left(\bigotimes_{j\neq i_0} \mathcal{H}_j\right)$ and $\langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle = \langle\phi_i|\phi_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}$. Moreover, we fix the normalization of the sate by setting $\sum_i |\lambda_i|^2 = 1$. We have:

$$\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle \geq \langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^+_{i_0 i'_0} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{I}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle.$$

Direct computation based on (3.62) shows that $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}^+_{i_0 i'_0} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{I}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle < 1$ which implies $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle > 0$. This concludes the proof of (3.59). □

3.2.2. Bosons

A criterion analogous to (3.59) holds also for the arbitrary finite number of bosonic particles with the infinite-dimensional single particle Hilbert space. We have $\mathcal{H}_b = \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is infinite dimensional. In analogy with the finite dimensional case (3.25) we distinguish symmetric product states (bosonic coherent states):

Lemma 3.5. *We have the following characterization of symmetric product product states defined on* $\mathcal{H}_b = \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$,

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_b \Longleftrightarrow C_b^2 = \langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}_b|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,, \tag{3.63}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}$ *projects onto symmetric subspace* $\mathcal{H}_b \otimes \mathcal{H}_b$ *and* $\mathbb{P}_b$ *is defined as in* (3.27).

Proof. We notice that the coherent bosonic states are precisely the completely symmetric separable states of the system of identical distinguishable particles with the single particle Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}$. Thus, we can apply criterion (3.59) restricted to $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$ to distinguish coherent bosonic states. More precisely, for $|\psi\rangle \in \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$ we have

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_b \Longleftrightarrow \langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,,$$

where operator $\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}$ is assumed to act on the Hilbert space $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$, with $\mathcal{H}_d$ defined in 3.2.1 and each single particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_i$ equal to $\mathcal{H}$. We conclude the proof by noting that for $|\psi\rangle \in \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L'\}}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle\,.$$

□

3.2.3. Fermions

The case of fermionic particles turns out to be the most demanding, albeit also the most interesting. System of L fermionic particles is described by $\mathcal{H}_f = \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$, where the single particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is infinite dimensional. We define "non-entangled" or coherent fermionic states analogously to the finite dimensional case,

$$\mathcal{M}_f = \{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_f) \,|\, |\psi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \wedge |\phi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\phi_L\rangle,\, |\phi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H},\, \langle\phi_i|\phi_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}\}\,. \tag{3.64}$$

We prove that the criterion (3.33) holds also in the infinite dimensional situation.

Lemma 3.6. *We have the following characterization of Slater determinants on a general separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_f = \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_f \Longleftrightarrow C_f^2(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \alpha\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,, \tag{3.65}$$

where $\alpha = \frac{2^l}{l+1}$ and $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}$ projects onto symmetric subspace $\mathcal{H}_f \otimes \mathcal{H}_f$. It is assumed that $\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}$ acts on $\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$, with $\mathcal{H}_d$ defined in 3.2.1 and each single particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_i$ equal to $\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. In order to prove (3.65) we consider the equivalent problem,

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_f \Longleftrightarrow \langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_f|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 1\,, \tag{3.66}$$

for $\mathbb{P}_f = \alpha\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'}$ and a normalized $|\psi\rangle \in \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$. Note that if the rank of $|\psi\rangle$ (i.e. the minimal number of elements of the form $|\phi_1\rangle \wedge |\phi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\phi_L\rangle$ needed to express $|\psi\rangle$) is finite, we have $|\psi\rangle \in \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}_0)$, where $\mathcal{H}_0$ is some finite dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Therefore, in this case (3.66) is proven as we can apply results from Subsection 3.1.3. If rank of $|\psi\rangle$ is infinite and $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_f|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle < 1$ there is nothing to prove. The only case left is when $|\psi\rangle$ has infinite rank and $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_f|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 1$. In the course of argumentation we will need the fact that the set of coherent fermionic states $\mathcal{M}_f$ is closed in $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})\right)$ (with respect to the metric (3.54)). In order to prove this we identify $\mathcal{M}_f$ with the set $\mathcal{D}_L(\mathcal{H})$ consisting of orthogonal projectors onto L dimensional subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$. The bijection $\alpha : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{D}_L(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as follows. For $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_f$ we have

$$\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{Span}\left\{|\phi_1\rangle,\ldots,|\phi_L\rangle\right\}}\,, \tag{3.67}$$

where[17] $|\psi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \wedge |\phi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\phi_L\rangle$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{Span}\left\{|\phi_1\rangle,\ldots,|\phi_L\rangle\right\}} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is an orthogonal projector onto L dimensional subspace $\mathrm{Span}\{|\phi_1\rangle, \ldots, |\phi_L\rangle\}$. On the set $\mathcal{D}_L(\mathcal{H})$ we have the metric induced from the trace distance on $\mathrm{HS}(\mathcal{H})$

$$\mathrm{d_L}\left(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}'\right) = \sqrt{2\left[L - \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{P}\mathbb{P}'\right)\right]}\,. \tag{3.68}$$

Using arguments analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.5 we see that the set $\mathcal{D}_L(\mathcal{H})$ is a complete with respect to the metric (3.68). The closedness of $\mathcal{M}_f$ with respect to the natural metric (3.54) on $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})\right)$ follows now the following inequality

$$\mathrm{d}_L\left(\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|), \alpha(|\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|)\right) \leq \sqrt{L}\mathrm{d}\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|, |\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|\right)$$

which is a direct consequence of the definitions of the mapping α as well as the metrics d and d_L.

We can now return to the original problem. We introduce the sequence of finite dimensional subspaces

$$\mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_2 \subset \ldots \subset \mathcal{H}_k \subset \ldots \subset \mathcal{H}\,, \tag{3.69}$$

such that $\bigcup_{l=1}^{l=\infty} \mathcal{H}_i = \mathcal{H}$. To the above sequence we associate corresponding sequence of subspaces of $\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}_1) \subset \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}_2) \subset \ldots \subset \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}_k) \subset \ldots \subset \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})\,. \tag{3.70}$$

[17] Mapping α does not depend upon the choice of orthonormal vectors $|\phi_1\rangle, \ldots, |\phi_L\rangle$ such that $|\psi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \wedge |\phi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\phi_L\rangle$.

Obviously we have $\bigcup_{l=1}^{l=\infty} \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_l) = \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H})$. We fix the index k and consider the following orthogonal splittings of $\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H})$ and $\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) \otimes \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H})$,

$$\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) = \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k) \oplus \left[\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k)\right]^{\perp}, \tag{3.71}$$

$$\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) \otimes \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) = \left[\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k) \otimes \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k)\right] \oplus \left[\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k) \otimes \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k)\right]^{\perp}, \tag{3.72}$$

where the orthogonal complements are taken with respect to the usual inner products on $\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H})$ and $\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) \otimes \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H})$ respectively. By $\mathbb{P}_k : \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) \to \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k)$ we denote the orthogonal projector on $\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k)$. We now prove that the infinite rank of $|\psi\rangle$ and $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_f|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 1$ yield to the contradiction. Let us first note that for a normalized $|\psi\rangle$ the condition $\langle\psi|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_f|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 1$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}_f|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle$. Consider the decomposition

$$|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = |\Psi_k\rangle + |\Psi_k^{\perp}\rangle, \tag{3.73}$$

where $|\Psi_k\rangle \in \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k) \otimes \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k)$ and $|\Psi_k^{\perp}\rangle \in \left[\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k) \otimes \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k)\right]^{\perp}$. We have $\mathbb{P}_f|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle$ and thus

$$\mathbb{P}_f|\Psi_k\rangle + \mathbb{P}_f|\Psi_k^{\perp}\rangle = |\Psi_k\rangle + |\Psi_k^{\perp}\rangle\,. \tag{3.74}$$

Because $\mathbb{P}_f$ preserves $\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k) \otimes \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}_k)$ we have $\langle\Psi_k^{\perp}|\mathbb{P}_f|\Psi_k\rangle = 0$ and therefore $\mathbb{P}_f|\Psi_k\rangle = |\Psi_k\rangle$. Notice that $|\Psi_k\rangle = \mathbb{P}_k \otimes \mathbb{P}_k\,(|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle)$ and therefore $|\Psi_k\rangle$ is a product state. Because $\mathbb{P}_f|\Psi_k\rangle = |\Psi_k\rangle$ we see that $\mathbb{P}_k|\psi\rangle$ is actually an (non-normalized) representative of some coherent fermionic state. We can repeat the above construction for the arbitrary number k. We get

$$1 = \lim_{k\to\infty} \langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_k|\psi\rangle, \tag{3.75}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_k|\psi\rangle$ is the (non-normalized) representative of some coherent state. We therefore get the convergence (in a sense of (3.54))

$$\frac{1}{\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_k|\psi\rangle}\mathbb{P}_k|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_k \overset{k\to\infty}{\to} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\,.$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_k|\psi\rangle}\mathbb{P}_k|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_k \in \mathcal{M}_f\,,$$

we get that $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_f$ as the set of coherent fermionic states $\mathcal{M}_f$ is closed in $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_f)$. This is clearly in contradiction with the assumption that $|\psi\rangle$ has infinite rank. □

3.3. Multilinear characterization of correlations in pure states

In this section we will extend the framework introduced in previous parts of the chapter. We will study polynomials of degree higher then two in the density matrix. It will be showed that polynomials of this kind do not only capture correlation types discussed previously but also cover more complicated types of correlations (e.g., genuine multipartite entanglement or correlations based on the notion of Schmidt number).



Figure 3.7. Pictorial representation of the expression $\langle\psi^{\otimes k}|A^{(k)}_{\mathcal{M}}|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle$ defining, via Eq. (3.76), the class of non-correlated $\mathcal{M}$.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the arbitrary finite-dimensional Hilbert space describing some physical system[18]. In what follows we will present of classes of pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ that can be described via the following polynomial condition

$$|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{M} \iff \langle\psi^{\otimes k}|\, A^{(k)}_{\mathcal{M}}|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle = 0\,, \tag{3.76}$$

where $A^{(k)}_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k} \to \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$ is a Hermitian operator acting on k-fold tensor product of $\mathcal{H}$. The subscript $\mathcal{M}$ expresses the fact that different operators $A^k_{\mathcal{M}}$ define, via 3.76, different classes of pure states $\mathcal{M}$. Superscript (k) denotes the number of copies of $\mathcal{H}$ which is needed to implement k. In what follows, unless it causes an ambiguity, we will drop both the subscript and the superscript when referring to $A^{(k)}_{\mathcal{M}}$. In accordance to the terminology introduced previously we will refer to the class of states $\mathcal{M}$ as a class of not-correlated states. Because $|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle \in \mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})$ ($\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$ completely symmetric under the exchange of factors in the multiple tensor product) we can, assume without loss of generality that operator A is actually defined on $\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})$. We will also assume[19] that $A \leq \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},k}$, where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},k} : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k} \to \mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the orthogonal projector onto $\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})$. An interest in classes of non-correlated pure states described by (3.76) is motivated by the following reasons:

- Condition (3.76) it is a natural generalization of (3.1).
- Via condition (3.76) it is possible to describe all classes of generalized coherent sates discussed before in this Chapter.
- The class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ does not have to be an orbit of some symmetry group represented in $\mathcal{H}$.
- In Chapter 5 we will show that the characterization (3.76) can be used to derive polynomial criteria for detection of correlated (with respect to the class $\mathcal{H}$) mixed states.

This Section is organized as follows. First we present the explicit form of operators A that characterize

- Multipartite pure states that do not exhibit "genuine multiparty entanglement" (GME) [3, 5];
- Bipartite states with Schmidt rank bounded above by some some number n [29, 92].

For definitions of above concepts consult Subsections (3.3.1) and (3.3.2) respectively. One can think of correlations defined by these classes of states as of possible generalizations of the usual notion of entanglement.

In the second part of the Section we prove that generalized coherent states discussed above can be equivalently characterized by a general multilinear condition (3.76). We give an explicit

[18] Discussion presented here can be generalized, under mild technical assumptions, to the infinite-dimensional case.

[19] Note that by imposing such a condition we do not lose the generality as the condition (3.76) is invariant under scaling.

form of operators A, acting on $\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})$ that characterize previously discussed classes of states: product states, product bosonic states and Slater determinants.

3.3.1. States that do not exhibit GME

Let us first recall the concept of genuine multiparty entanglement.

Definition 3.1. Consider a Hilbert space associated to the system of L distinguishable particles, $\mathcal{H}_d = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_L$. We say that a pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_d)$ is 2-separable if and only if it can be written as a product state with respect to some bipartition of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_d$. In other words,

$$|\psi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle_X \otimes |\phi_1\rangle_{\bar{X}} \tag{3.77}$$

for some subset $X \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$ which define splitting of the system of L particles onto two subsystems (see Figure 3.8):

$$\{1, 2, \ldots, L\} = X \cup \bar{X},\ \mathcal{H}_d = \left(\bigotimes_{i\in X} \mathcal{H}_i\right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i\in \bar{X}} \mathcal{H}_i\right). \tag{3.78}$$

Note that in (3.77) and (3.78) we reordered terms in the tensor product appearing in the definition of $\mathcal{H}_d$. In what follows we will denote the set of 2-separable states by $\mathcal{M}_d^2$. A state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_d$ will be called called genuinely multiparty entangled if and only if it is not 2-separable.



Figure 3.8. Exemplary bipartition of a composite system consisting of six subsystems.

A class of "non-correlated" states $\mathcal{M}_d^2 \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_d)$ is a natural generalization of separable states from the bipartite setting: it consists of states that are separable with respect to some bipartition of the composite system onto two subsystem. Let us remark that $\mathcal{M}_d^{L2}$ is invariant under the action of local unitary group but is not an orbit of this group in $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_d)$. Let us consider a specific example of $L = 3$ Indeed, for $L = 3$ we have $\mathcal{H}_d = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3$ and

$$\mathcal{M}_d^2 = \mathcal{M}_d^{1:23} \cup \mathcal{M}_d^{2:13} \cup \mathcal{M}_d^{3:12}, \tag{3.79}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_d^{X:YZ} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_C)$ describes the class of the splitting of a composite system in the cut $X : YZ$. The graphical presentation of the set $\mathcal{M}_d^2 \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3)$ is presented in Figure 3.9. As $\mathcal{M}_d^{X:YZ}$ itself consists of many orbits of local unitary group then the same concerns $\mathcal{M}_d^2$.

We now present a polynomial condition that characterizes the class of L-particle separable states. For simplicity we restrict our considerations to the special case of $L = 3$ subsystems. Arguments presented below can be easily extended to the arbitrary number of subsystems.



Figure 3.9. Graphical presentation of the structure of the set $\mathcal{M}_d^2 = \mathcal{M}_d^{1:23} \cup \mathcal{M}_d^{2:13} \cup \mathcal{M}_d^{3:12} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3)$.

Lemma 3.7. *The class of pure states $\mathcal{M}_d^2 \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3)$ that do not exhibit GME can be characterized by the operator A_{GME} acting on $\mathrm{Sym}^6(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3)$,*

$$|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{M}_d^3 \Longleftrightarrow \langle\psi^{\otimes 6}|A_{\mathrm{GME}}|\psi^{\otimes 6}\rangle = 0\,. \tag{3.80}$$

Operator A_{GME} is given by

$$A_{\mathrm{GME}} = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},6} \circ \left(A^{1:23} \otimes A^{2:13} \otimes A^{3:12}\right) \circ \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},6}\,, \tag{3.81}$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},6} \text{ - projector onto completelly symmetric sybspace of } (\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3)^{\otimes 6}\,,$$

$$A^{1:23} = \mathbb{P}^-_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^-_{\{23\}\{2'3'\}} \tag{3.82}$$

and the remaining operators $A^{X:YZ}$ are defined in the analogous manner. [20].

Proof. The proof follows immediately from (3.79) and from the fact that

$$\langle\psi^{\otimes 6}|A_{\mathrm{GME}}|\psi^{\otimes 6}\rangle = C^2_{1:23}(|\psi\rangle) \cdot C^2_{2:13}(|\psi\rangle) \cdot C^2_{3:12}(|\psi\rangle)\,,$$

where by $C^2_{X:YZ}$ we denote the quadratic polynomial that characterizes the separability (in a sense of Eq. (3.23)) of a state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3)$ with respect to the bipartition $X : YZ$. □

3.3.2. Bipartite pure states with the bounded Schmidt rank

Consider a system of two distinguishable particles with a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. Let $d = \max\{\dim\mathcal{H}_A, \dim\mathcal{H}_b\}$. Every pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ admits a Schmidt decomposition [49],

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{i=d} \lambda_i |e_i\rangle|f_i\rangle\,, \tag{3.83}$$

where $\lambda_i \geq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^{i=d} \lambda_i^2 = 1$. Moreover, sets $\{|e_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=d}$ and $\{|f_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=d}$ are orthogonal normalized vectors in $\mathcal{H}_A$ and respectively in $\mathcal{H}_B$.

[20] In expression (3.82) we extended in a natural fashion the notation introduced in Subsection 3.1.1. The operator $\mathbb{P}^-_{\{23\}\{2'3'\}}$ denotes the orthogonal projector onto the subspace $\left(\mathcal{H}_1^{\otimes 2}\right) \otimes \bigwedge(\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3) \subset \mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3)$.

Definition 3.2. A Schmidt rank of a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ is a number of nonzero coefficients in (3.83). We define the class of bipartite pure states $\mathcal{M}_n$ as the set of states that have Schmidt number less or equal than n ($1 \leq n \leq d$),

$$\mathcal{M}_n = \{|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \,|\, \text{at most } n\text{of } \lambda_i\text{from (3.83) are nonzero}\} \,. \tag{3.84}$$

We have the following chain of inclusions (see Figure 3.10for a graphical representation),

$$\mathcal{M}_d = \mathcal{M}_1 \subset \mathcal{M}_2 \subset \ldots \subset \mathcal{M}_d = \mathcal{D}_1 \left(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\right) . \tag{3.85}$$



Figure 3.10. Graphical presentation of the hierarchy of inclusions (3.85).

In what follows we use the following isomorphism of multiple tensor powers of $\left(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\right)^{\otimes k}$,

$$\left(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\right)^{\otimes k} \approx \left(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes k}\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes k}\right) . \tag{3.86}$$

We can now state the advertised polynomial characterization of bipartite pure states with the Schmidt rank equal at most n.

Lemma 3.8. *The class of pure states $\mathcal{M}_n$ that have a Schmidt rank at most n (see* (3.84)*) can be characterized by the operator A_n acting on* $\mathrm{Sym}^{n+1}\left(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\right)$,

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_n \Longleftrightarrow \langle\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}|A_n|\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}\rangle = 0 \,. \tag{3.87}$$

Operator A_k is given by

$$A_n = \mathbb{P}_A^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}} \otimes \mathbb{P}_B^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}} , \tag{3.88}$$

where

$\mathbb{P}_A^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}}$ *-is a projector onto the subspace* $\bigwedge^{n+1}\left(\mathcal{H}_A\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes(n+1)}\right) \subset \left(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\right)^{\otimes(n+1)}$,

$\mathbb{P}_b^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}}$ *-is a projector onto the subspace* $\left(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes(n+1)}\right) \otimes \bigwedge^{n+1}\left(\mathcal{H}_B\right) \subset \left(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\right)^{\otimes(n+1)}$.

Note that in the above we have used identification (3.86)*.*

Proof. For a given $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{M}_n$ expanding its $n+1$ copies, $|\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}\rangle$, in the space $\left(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes(n+1)}\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes(n+1)}\right)$ gives terms of the form

$$\left(|e_{i_1}\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |e_{i_{k+1}}\rangle\right) \otimes \left(|f_{i_1}\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |f_{i_{k+1}}\rangle\right) ,$$

where at least one pair of indices overlap. Therefore, by definition of the operator A_n, we have $A_n|\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}\rangle = 0$. Conversely, one easily checks that that for $|\psi\rangle \notin \mathcal{M}_n$ we have

$$\langle\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}|A|\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}\rangle \neq 0\,.$$

Operator A_n has a support on $\mathrm{Sym}^{n+1}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$. It follows from the fact that for any $\tau \in S_{n+1}$, represented in a natural manner (see Subsection 2.4.3 for details) on $(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)^{\otimes n+1}$, the following identity holds

$$A_n\tau = \tau A_n = A_n\,. \tag{3.89}$$

The above expression can be verified using the structure of A_n and observing that $\tau = \tau_A \otimes \tau_B$, where $\tau_{A(B)}$ denote the permutation on Alice's (Bob's) registers under the identification (3.86). □

Let us remark that from the definition of operators $A_n : \mathrm{Sym}^{n+1}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) \to \mathrm{Sym}^{n+1}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ it is clear that they are LU-invariant, i.e.

$$U^{\otimes n+1} A_n \left(U^\dagger\right)^{\otimes n+1} = A_n\,,$$

for $U = U_A \otimes U_B$, where $U_{A,B} \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}_{A,B})$.

Let us conclude our considerations on Schmidt rank of quantum states by explicitly computing the polynomial $\langle\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}|A_n|\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}\rangle$ for arbitrary pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$. Let the Schmidt decomposition of $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ be given by Eq.*(3.83)*. The following formula holds*

$$\langle\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}|A_n|\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}\rangle = \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \sum_{\substack{X \subset \{1,\ldots,d\} \\ |X| = n+1}} \left(\prod_{i\in X} \lambda_i^2\right). \tag{3.90}$$

Proof. The proof is given in Section 8.1 of the Appendix (see page 160). □

The above result shows that there is a connection between the polynomial in\invariant based on A_n and d-concurrence [103]. More precisely we have

$$\sqrt[n+1]{\langle\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}|A_n|\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}\rangle} \propto C_{n+1}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\,,$$

where $C_{n+1}(\cdot)$ is the concurrence [103] of order $n+1$.

3.3.3. Generalized coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups

In this subsection we present the multilinear characterization of the manifold of generalized coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie group. The considered setting is exactly the same as in Section 3.1: we have a compact simply-connected Lie group K irreducibly represented on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ ($\lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ denotes the highest weight characterizing the representation). We use the same notation as in Section 3.1: Π, π and $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_0}$ denote respectively representation of Lie group K, representation of the corresponding Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ Lie algebra, and the class of generalized coherent states in $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$. We would like to remark that the result presented here is of different type then ones presented in Subsections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. There we had to consider polynomials of degree higher that two in order to grasp a given class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$. Here however we fix the class of pure states $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_0}$ (we know its characterization in

terms of polynomial of degree two - see Proposition 3.2) and describe its characterizations via polynomials of arbitrary degree in the density matrix. In order to state our results we have to first introduce some notation. Let $k > 1$ be a natural number. By the usual tensor product procedure (see Eq. (2.49)) we construct representations of K and $\mathfrak{k}$ respectively on $\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k}$,

$$\Pi^{\otimes k} : K \to \mathrm{U}\left(\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k}\right), U \to \Pi\left(U\right)^{\otimes k} \tag{3.91}$$

$$\pi^{\otimes k} : \mathfrak{k} \to i \cdot \mathrm{Herm}\left(\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k}\right), X \to \pi\left(X\right) \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)} + \mathbb{I} \otimes \pi\left(X\right) \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-2)} + \ldots \tag{3.92}$$

We have a property analogous to the one presented in Proposition (3.1).

Proposition 3.7. *Representation $\Pi^{\otimes k}$ is, in general, reducible. The decomposition of $\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k}$ onto irreducible components reads,*

$$\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k} = \mathcal{H}^{k\lambda_0} \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta < k\lambda_0} \mathcal{H}^{\beta}, \tag{3.93}$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{k\lambda_0}$ denotes the representation characterized by the highest weight $k\lambda_0$ and $\bigoplus_{\beta<k\lambda_0} \mathcal{H}^{\beta}$ denotes the direct sum of all other irreducible subrepresentations of the group K in $\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k}$.

Proof. The proof is a simple generalization of the reasoning contained in the proof of Proposition 3.1. □

We can now present a multilinear characterization of the set of coherent states which is a direct generalization of the result presented in Proposition 3.2. The result we state bellow is certainly well-known to mathematicians working on algebraic geometry but the author is not aware of any specific reference where it is stated.

Lemma 3.9. *The set of generalized coherent states $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_0}$ can be characterized by the following condition*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_0} \iff \langle\psi^{\otimes k}| \left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,k}} - \mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0}\right) |\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle = 0, \tag{3.94}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,k}}$ is a projector onto $\mathrm{Sym}^k\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ and the operator $\mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0} : \left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k} \to \left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k}$ is an orthonormal projector onto irreducible representation $\mathcal{H}^{k\lambda_0} \subset \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$.

Proof. The proof of Lemma (3.9) is given in Section 8.1 of the Appendix (see 161). □

In what follows we present explicit formulas for $\mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0}$ for classes of coherent states discussed already in this chapter: separable sates, separable bosonic states and Slater determinants. We will use the following convenient embeddings of vectors spaces

$$\left(\mathrm{Sym}^L\left(\mathcal{H}\right)\right)^{\otimes k} \subset \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i\right)^{\otimes k} \approx \bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i^{\otimes k}, \tag{3.95}$$

$$\left(\bigwedge^{L}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)\right)^{\otimes k} \subset \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i\right)^{\otimes k} \approx \bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i^{\otimes k}, \tag{3.96}$$

where $\mathcal{H} \approx \mathcal{H}_i \approx \mathbb{C}^N$ is the single particle Hilbert space of the either bosonic or fermionic system considered. Note that in the above we used the natural relabeling of factors in the composite tensor product,

$$\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i\right)^{\otimes k} \approx \bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i^{\otimes k}. \tag{3.97}$$

In what follows, in order to distinguish different spaces that appear in $\mathcal{H}_i^{\otimes k}$ we will use additional labeling,

$$\mathcal{H}_i^{\otimes k} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^{k} \mathcal{H}_{i^{(j)}} \, . \tag{3.98}$$

Consequently, we obtain the following decomposition

$$\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i \right)^{\otimes k} \approx \bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i^{\otimes k} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{k} \mathcal{H}_{i^{(j)}} \right) \, . \tag{3.99}$$

In accordance to 3.99 we introduce the following notation

- $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\left\{i^{(1)},\ldots,i^{(k)}\right\}}$ - orthonormal projector onto totally symmetric subspace of $\mathcal{H}_i^{\otimes k}$ (see Eq. (3.99)).
- $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\left\{1^{(j)},\ldots,L^{(j)}\right\}}$−is the orthonormal projector onto totally symmetric subspace of $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_{i^{(j)}}$.
- $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\left\{1^{(j)},\ldots,L^{(j)}\right\}}$−is the orthonormal projector onto totally asymmetric subspace of $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_{i^{(j)}}$.

Lemma 3.10. *Under the notation introduced in Subsection 3.1.1 the closed expression for the projector operator* $\mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0}$ *(see* (3.94)*) for the case of* $K = \times^L\big(\mathrm{SU}(N)\big)$ *and* $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_{dist} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i$ *reads*

$$\mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0} = \mathbb{P}^{(k)}_{dist} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\left\{i^{(1)},\ldots,i^{(k)}\right\}} \, .. \tag{3.100}$$

Sketch of the proof. The proof of (3.100) is a direct generalization of the proof of Lemma 3.22. The main idea is to observe that the subspace (note that we are using convention (3.99))

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathrm{Sym}^k\left(\mathcal{H}_i\right) \subset \mathrm{Sym}^k\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i \right)$$

is the irreducible representation of the group $\times^L\big(\mathrm{SU}(N)\big)$. □

Figure 3.11 presents a graphical representation of the operator $\mathbb{P}^{(k)}_d$.

Lemma 3.11. *Under the notation introduced in Subsection 3.1.2 the closed expression for the projector operator* $\mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0}$ *(see* (3.94)*) for the case of* $K = SU(N)$ *and* $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_b = \mathrm{Sym}^L\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$ *reads*

$$\mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0} = \mathbb{P}^{(k)}_b = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\left\{i^{(1)},\ldots,i^{(k)}\right\}} \right) \circ \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\left\{1^{(j)},\ldots,L^{(j)}\right\}} \right) \, .. \tag{3.101}$$

Sketch of the proof. The proof is completely analogous to the proof of Lemma 3.2. The operator $\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\left\{i^{(1)},\ldots,i^{(k)}\right\}} \right) \circ \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\left\{1^{(j)},\ldots,L^{(j)}\right\}} \right)$ is a projector onto $\mathrm{Sym}^{k\cdot L}\left(\mathcal{H}\right) \subset \mathrm{Sym}^k\left(\mathrm{Sym}^L\left(\mathcal{H}\right)\right)$, which is an irreducible representation of $SU\left(N\right)$. □

Figure 3.12 presents a graphical representation of the operator $\mathbb{P}^{(k)}_b$.

The polynomial invariant

$$\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathrm{Sym}^L\left(\mathcal{H}\right)\right) \ni |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \longrightarrow \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k} \right] \mathbb{P}^{(k)}_b \right) \in \mathbb{R}$$

was used in [104] to study the problem of unitary equivalence of multiphoton states under the action of linear optics.



Figure 3.11. Graphical presentation of the operator $\mathbb{P}_d^{(k)}$ in $\mathcal{H}_d^{\otimes k}$. Red circles correspond to symmetrizations in the relevant factors of $\mathcal{H}_d^{\otimes k}$.



Figure 3.12. Graphical presentation of the operator $\mathbb{P}_k^{(k)}$ treated as an operator on $\mathcal{H}_d^{\otimes k}$. Red circles and rectangles correspond to symmetrizations in the relevant factors of $\mathcal{H}_d^{\otimes k}$ containing $\mathcal{H}_b^{\otimes k}$.

Lemma 3.12. *Under the notation introduced in Subsection 3.1.3 the closed expression for the projector operator* $\mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0}$ *(see* (3.94)*) for the case of* $K = SU(N)$ *and* $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_f = \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$ *reads*

$$\mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0} = \mathbb{P}_f^{(k)} = \alpha_k \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathbb{P}^{\text{sym}}_{\left\{i^{(1)},\ldots,i^{(k)}\right\}} \right) \circ \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\left\{1^{(j)},\ldots,L^{(j)}\right\}} \right) , \tag{3.102}$$

where

$$\alpha_k = \alpha\left(\left(\overbrace{k,k,\ldots,k}^{L},0,\ldots 0\right)\right)$$

and the function $\alpha(\lambda)$ *is given by Eq.*(2.100)*.*

Proof. Let us first notice that $\text{Im}\left(\mathbb{P}_f^{(k)}\right) \subset \mathcal{H}_f^{\otimes k}$. Moreover, $\mathbb{P}_f^{(k)} : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k\cdot L} \to \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k\cdot L}$ projects onto subspace characterized by the highest weight

$$k\cdot\lambda_f == \left(\overbrace{k,k,\ldots,k}^{L},0,\ldots 0\right) .$$

By the virtue of Proposition (3.7) there is only one representation of SU (N) characterized by the highest weight $k \cdot \lambda_f$. □

Figure 3.13 presents a graphical representation of the operator $\mathbb{P}_f^{(k)}$.



Figure 3.13. Graphical presentation of the operator $\mathbb{P}_f^{(k)}$ treated as an operator on $\mathcal{H}_d^{\otimes k}$. Red circles correspond to symmetrizations and blue rectangles to antisymmetrizations in the relevant factors of the space $\mathcal{H}_d^{\otimes k}$ containing $\mathcal{H}_f^{\otimes k}$.

3.4. Summary and open problems

In this chapter we provided a polynomial characterization of different classes of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ that appear in many physical problems. Our approach was independent on the choice of the basis and the characterization we gave was group-invariant, provided there existed a symmetry group preserving the set $\mathcal{M}$. We described the classes $\mathcal{M}$ as the null sets of real non-negative homogenous polynomials in the density matrix $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ of a state (also in infinite-dimensional settings). In general the descriptions studied were of the form

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \operatorname{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right] A\right) = 0\,, \tag{3.103}$$

where A is non-negative operator satisfying $A \leq \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},k}$.

The following list contains the most important results contained in this chapter.

- **Section 3.1**. A characterization of coherent states for irreducible representations of compact simply-connected Lie groups $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ as zero sets of a group-invariant quadratic polynomials (k in Eq.(3.103) equals 2). We presented an explicit form of the operator A for the following classes of pure states: product states of distinguishable particles, bosonic product states, Slater determinants, and pure fermionic Gaussian states.
- **Section 3.2**. A polynomial characterization of the following classes of pure states in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces: product states of distinguishable particles, bosonic product states, Slater determinants. We represent these classes as a zero sets of a quadratic polynomial (k in Eq.(3.103) equals 2) which is group-invariant.
- **Section 3.3**. A characterization of coherent states in irreducible representations of compact simply-connected Lie groups $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ as a zero sets of a group-invariant polynomials of degree k. We presented an explicit for of the operator A for the following classes of pure

states: product states of distinguishable particles, bosonic product states, Slater determinants. We also provided a similar characterization of classes of pure states consisting of Characterization of pure bipartite states with bounded Schmidt rank and 2-separable states in multiparty setting.

Open problems

We now give some open problems connected to the subject of this Chapter.

- It is natural to ask whether a similar polynomial characterizations is also possible for other classes of states which naturally appear in quantum information and were not captured in this chapter. We give here examples of such classes. Depending upon concrete physical system in question it is certainly possible to invent many other classes.
  — Matrix Product States (MPS) and Projected Entangled Pair States (PEPS) [105]. These are important classes of variational states that turned useful in describing respectively 1D and 2D lattice quantum systems.
  — A notion of k-coherent states was recently introduced in the context of the theory of coherent delocalization in [106]. From the mathematical perspective k-coherent pure states are specified by the choice of the class of pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and the natural number k. We say that a pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is k-coherent if its vector representative can be written as
  $$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i |\phi_i\rangle ,$$
  where $\alpha_i \neq 0$ and $|\phi_i\rangle$ are vector representatives of states $|\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i| \in \mathcal{M}$. If the class $\mathcal{M}$ is an algebraic variety (i.e. it is gives as a null set of some polynomial) there is a natural connection between sets consisting of k-coherent states and so-called Secant varieties [107].
  — Classes of states $\mathcal{M}$ relevant for quantum optics. In this context the appropriate Hilbert space is the bosonic Fock space (corresponding to one or many optical modes) [19]. The relevant classes of coherent states are: optical coherent sates, squeezed states and pure bosonic Gaussian states. Each of these classes is an orbit of the appropriate symmetry group: the Heisenberg group [19], Metaplectic group [25] and affine-Metaplectic group [25] receptively. The main technical difficulty that appears while studying this problem is the fact that the relevant Hilbert space is infinite-dimensional and therefore functional-theoretic aspects have to be taken int account.
- A polynomial characterization of the class of pure Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ and quantum de-Finetti theorem [108] was used in [22] to derive a complete hierarchy of semidefinite programs that decide whether a given even state $\mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ belongs to the convex hull of $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}_g^c$. Similar techniques have been used before in the context of entanglement [70]. It would be a very interesting to derive a complete hierarchy of criteria characterizing convex hulls of classes of states $\mathcal{M}$ defined via Eq.(3.103).
- In [109] it was showed that entanglement of a mixed bipartite state can be characterized by checking the weak optimality[21] of an entanglement witness acting on an auxiliary extended Hilbert space. This approach can be generalized to the setting considered in this chapter and throughout this thesis. It would be therefore interesting to investigate the implications of this on the problem of generalized entanglement.

[21] A witness $W \in \text{Herm}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ is said to be weakly optimal if and only if its expectation value vanishes on some product vector.

4. Complete characterization of correlations in mixed states

In the previous chapter we gave a polynomial characterization of classes of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$. We showed that a number physically relevant of classes of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ are a zero sets of a real homogenous polynomial

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \mathrm{tr}\left(A\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right]\right) = 0\,, \tag{4.1}$$

where $A \in \mathrm{Herm}_+\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$. This chapter as well as Chapters 8.3 and 8.4 will be devoted to study notion of correlations defined by the choice of the class $\mathcal{M}$. As explained in Section 1.1 in this thesis we will be concerned with correlations present in general mixed states specified by the probabilistic mixtures of pure states belonging to the class $\mathcal{M}$. Given a class of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M}$ we define non-correlated mixed states as a convex hull, $\mathcal{M}^c$, of $\mathcal{M}$ in the set of all mixed states of a considered system:

$$\mathcal{M}^c = \left\{ \rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \;\middle|\; |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \in \mathcal{M},\, p_i \geq 0,\, \sum_i p_i = 1 \right\}.$$

In the current chapter we will consider cases for which the class $\mathcal{M}$ consists of coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups irreducibly represented in $\mathcal{H}$. In particular we will be concerned with the following problem.

Problem 4.1. Let $\mathcal{M}$ consists of coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie group K irreducibly represented in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Characterize the cases when it is possible to describe the set of non-correlated states $\mathcal{M}^c$ by an explicit analytical criterion[1].

The above problem is not stated, for the sake of clarity, in a rigorous manner. Let us now specify more precisely what kind of "analytical criterion" we have in mind. In Section 2.2 we discussed the Wotters concurrence [110] $C(\rho)$ (see Eq.(2.18)) for the case of entanglement in the case of two qbits. The concurrence $C(\rho)$ posses the properties we desire: it has a closed-form expression and satisfies

$$C(\rho) > 0 \iff \rho \,\text{is entangled}\;,\; C(\rho) = 0 \iff \rho \,\text{is separable}\;.$$

where property being separable corresponds to being inside the convex hull of the set of pure product states for two qbits ($\rho \in \mathcal{M}^c_{dist}$). It turns out that in general it is possible to write down a formula analogous to Eq.(2.18) provided there exists an antiunitary conjugation[2] θ such that $|\langle\psi|\theta\psi\rangle| = 0$ if and only if $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}$. The reason for which this condition allows for analytic

[1] By "an explicit analytical" criterion we mean a function $f : \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ that have a closed form (the dependance of f on coefficients of ρ is known) and values of f separates $\mathcal{M}^c$ from its complement (for instance we may have $f(\rho) = 0$ if and only if $\rho \in \mathcal{M}^c$).

[2] The definition of the antiunitary conjugation is given in the next section.

characterization of $\mathcal{M}^c$ will be explained in the next section and is known under the name of Uhlmann-Wotters construction [111]. We are now ready to state rigorously the problem we will investigate in this chapter.

Problem 4.2. Let $\mathcal{M}$ consists of coherent states of a compact simply-connected Lie group K irreducibly represented, via the representation $\Pi : K \to \mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H})$, in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Characterize the cases when $\mathcal{M}$ can be described by the condition

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff |\langle\psi|\theta\psi\rangle| = 0\,, \tag{4.2}$$

where θ is a unitary conjugation which is K-invariant, i.e.

$$\Pi(k)\,\theta\Pi^{\dagger}(k) = \theta\,, \tag{4.3}$$

for all $k \in K$.

The motivation for the study of this problem stems from the fact that, except for a number of distributed, seemingly unrelated results [20, 21, 112], so far there has been no complete understanding of cases when coherent states allow for the characterization via (4.2). A certain degree of unification was achieved in [89] and the investigations presented here can be treated as a generalization of the results these obtained in [89].

This chapter is organized as follows. In Section 4.1 we describe the Uhlmann-Wotters construction and present the complete solution to the Problem 4.2. In Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 we present a complete group-theoretical characterization of coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups that admit a characterization via the antiunitary, group-invariant conjugation. In Section 4.2 we apply our result to study the type of correlations that has not been studied before by this formalism: correlations defined by choosing $\mathcal{M}$ to consist of pure fermionic Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g$ (c.f. Subsection 3.1.5). This type of correlations is important for the problem of classical simulability of a model of quantum computation consisting of Fermionic Linear Optics augmented with noisy ancilla state ρ. We define this model of quantum computation and explain that the problem of its classical simulability can be partially solved by determining whether a mixed state ρ is a convex combination of pure Gaussian states (we call such states convex-Gaussian states). It turns out that the methods developed in Section 4.1 allow to characterize $\mathcal{M}_g^c$ for the lowest dimensional non-trivial case of the Fermionic Fock space of $d = 4$ modes. This characterization allows us to solve an open problem recently posed in [22] and to study the geometry of the set of convex-Gaussian states in the space of all states defined on four mode Fock space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}(\mathbb{C}^4)$. We conclude the chapter in Section 4.3 where we summarize the obtained results and state some open problems.

Results presented in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 were published in [93] and [113] respectively.

4.1. Classes of coherent states for which Uhlmann–Wotters construction works

In this section we classify all the cases when the set of coherent states[3] $\mathcal{M}$ of a compact simply-connected Lie group can be characterized by condition (4.2). This description allows to give a simple analytic characterization of the class of non-correlated states $\mathcal{M}^c$. The section is organized as follows. In Subsection 4.1.1 we present some technical tools that will be useful

[3] In order to simplify the notation we will use the symbol $\mathcal{M}$ to refer to the set of coherent states of the particular K in the representation $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$of interest.

in further considerations. We introduce there the following concepts: antiunitary conjugation, convex roof extensions and Uhlmann-Wotters construction. We also discuss in more details some properties of completely positive maps and Jamiołkowski-Choi isomorphism. In Subsection 4.1.2 we give a complete solution to Problem 4.2 which employs the methods mentioned above as well as some facts form representation theory and differential geometry.

4.1.1. Technical tools

We first describe some properties of antilinear operators. An antilinear operator $\vartheta : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is defined by the condition:

$$\vartheta\left(\alpha|\phi\rangle + \beta|\psi\rangle\right) = \alpha^*\vartheta\left(|\phi\rangle\right) + \beta^*\vartheta\left(|\psi\rangle\right) , \tag{4.4}$$

valid for all $|\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. Just like in the case of linear operators it is customary to abbreviate $\vartheta\left(|\psi\rangle\right)$ by $\vartheta|\psi\rangle$ or $|\vartheta\psi\rangle$. The Hermitian conjugate of the antilinear operator ϑ, denoted by $\vartheta^\dagger$, is defined by

$$\langle\psi|\left(\vartheta^\dagger|\phi\rangle\right) = \langle\phi|\left(\vartheta|\psi\rangle\right) . \tag{4.5}$$

We will always assume implicitly that the antilinear operator acts "on the right", when put between "bra" and "ket". Consequently, we will use the following convention

$$\langle\psi|\theta|\phi\rangle \equiv \langle\phi|\left(\theta^\dagger|\psi\rangle\right) . \tag{4.6}$$

A product of linear and antilinear operator is antilinear. The product of two antilinear operators is a linear operator. For two operators A, B (each being linear or antilinear) we have $(AB)^\dagger = B^\dagger A^\dagger$. Moreover, we have $\left(\vartheta^\dagger\right)^\dagger = \vartheta$ for each antilinear operator ϑ. Recall (c.f. Section 2.2) that a mapping $\theta : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is called antiunitary if it is antilinear and satisfies

$$\langle\theta\psi|\theta\phi\rangle = \langle\psi|\phi\rangle^* ,$$

for all $|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. Every anti-unitary operator θ admits a decomposition $\theta = U\mathcal{K}$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is the conjugation in some fixed orthonormal basis (see Eq.2.8) and U is the unitary operator. We can now define

Definition 4.1. An antiunitary operator θ is called *anti-unitary conjugation* if and only if it is antiunitary and $\theta^\dagger = \theta$.

The above definition is equivalent to $U\mathcal{K} - \mathcal{K}U^\dagger = 0$. Consequently the conjugation $\mathcal{K}$ preserves eigenvectors of U. Let $|\psi_k\rangle$ be an eigenvector of U corresponding to eigenvalue $e^{i\phi_k}$. We have

$$\theta e^{i\alpha}|\psi_k\rangle = e^{i(\phi_k - \alpha)}|\psi_k\rangle ,$$

and therefore, by gauging out the phase α, we can obtain a vector $|\psi'\rangle$ which is the eigenvector of θ with eigenvalue one. The same procedure can be repeated for all eigenvectors of U. Consequently we obtain that $\theta = \mathcal{K}'$, where $\mathcal{K}'$ is a complex conjugation in a suitably-chosen orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$.

Let us now present how the characterization of coherent states via the polynomial condition (4.1) can be used to formally solve the problem of characterization of the set $\mathcal{M}^c$ via the method of convex roof extension (see Section 2.2). Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ be the carrier space of the irreducible representation of a compact simply-connected Lie group K and $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ consists of coherent states of this group. Let us define a function $g : \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$g\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right) = \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}\left(\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}\right)\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes 2}\right]\right)} , \tag{4.7}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ is the projection onto the representation with the highest weight $2\lambda_0$ embedded in $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H})$ (see Eq.(3.6)). It is clear that g is well defined, continuous and reaches the minimum (equal to 0) on the set of coherent states $\mathcal{M}$. Therefore $g^{\cup}:\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})\to\mathbb{R}$ distinguishes between correlated and non-correlated states (c.f. Section 2.2):

$$g^{\cup}(\rho)\geq 0 \text{ and } g^{\cup}(\rho)=0 \text{ if and only if } \rho\in\mathcal{M}^c\,.$$

Due to the fact that both g and $g^{\cup}$ are 1-homogenous, we can write

$$g^{\cup}(\rho)=\inf_{\sum_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|=\rho}\sum_k\sqrt{\mathrm{tr}\left(\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}-\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}\right)\left[|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|^{\otimes 2}\right]\right)}\,, \tag{4.8}$$

where the infimum is taken over all decompositions of ρ into a sum of operators of rank 1 (not necessary normalized). In general the infimum in the formula (4.8) cannot be computed explicitly for an arbitrary $\rho\in\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$; one then has to rely on various, relatively easily computable estimates, which, however, give only sufficient criteria for detection of correlations [69] leaving a margin of uncertainty in discriminating mixed classical states. There are cases when the effective computation of the infimum is possible [89]. They correspond to situations when the operator expectation value in (4.7) can be expressed in terms of some anti-unitary conjugation[4] $\theta:\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\to\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$,

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}-\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}\right)\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes 2}\right]\right)=c\,|\langle\psi|\theta|\psi\rangle|^2\,, \tag{4.9}$$

where $c>0$ is a constant.

We will use the following result by Uhlmann and Wotters.

Fact 4.1. *([111]) Let $\theta:\mathcal{H}\to\mathcal{H}$ be the antiunitary conjugation on N dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Let*

$$g^{\cup}(\rho)=\inf_{\sum_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|=\rho}|\langle\psi_k|\theta|\psi_k\rangle|\,. \tag{4.10}$$

We have

$$g^{\cup}(\rho)=\max\left\{0,\lambda_1-\sum_{k=2}^{N}\lambda_k\right\}\,, \tag{4.11}$$

where $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^{k=N}$ are increasingly ordered eigenvalues of the operator $\sqrt{\rho\tilde{\rho}}$, where $\tilde{\rho}=\theta\rho\theta$ (compare Eq.(2.18)).

Moreover, the optimal decomposition in (4.10) *may be constructed out of $2n+1$ rank one operators, where $2n<N\leq 2n+1$.*

According to our knowledge the situations expressed by (4.9) are the only ones in which it is possible to compute g explicitly. The list of known examples of this kind described in the literature [20, 21, 112] is short and contains only three examples which we list below.

1. The three-dimensional (labeled by spin $S=1$) representation $\mathcal{H}^1$ of $\mathrm{SU}(2)$. It is a well known fact that $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H}^1)=\mathcal{H}^2\oplus\mathcal{H}^0$, where $\mathcal{H}^0$ is the trivial representation (labeled by spin $S=0$) and $\mathcal{H}^2$ is the five-dimensional representation (labeled by spin $S=2$). This representation is used in the description of two bosons of spin $S=1$. The corresponding class of coherent states $\mathcal{M}$ consists of standard spin coherent states in the representation $\mathcal{H}^1$ [112].
2. The four-dimensional representation of $\mathrm{SU}(2)\times\mathrm{SU}(2)$ defined by its natural action on $\mathcal{H}=\mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2$. This representation is used to describe entanglement of two qbits [110].

[4] Note that we have used the convention from Eq.(4.6), i.e. we assume that the antiunitary operator acts always "on the right".

3. The six-dimensional representation of $\mathrm{SU}(4)$ labeled by highest weight[5]

$$\lambda_0 = (1, 1, 0, 0) \ .$$

The carrier space of this representation is isomorphic to the six dimensional representation of $\mathrm{SU}(4)$ acting on $\bigwedge^2 \mathbb{C}^4$. This representation is natural for the description of the entanglement of two fermions with spin $S = 3/2$ [20, 21].

It is important to note that in each of those cases there exists an epimorphism[6] h of the appropriate group K onto the group $\mathrm{SO}(N)$, where N is the dimension of the irreducible representation of K.

$$\begin{aligned} h &: \mathrm{SU}(2) \to \mathrm{SO}(3) \ (\text{Spin-1 coherent states}) \,, \\ h &: \mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{SU}(2) \to \mathrm{SO}(3) \ (\text{two qbits}) \,, \\ h &: \mathrm{SU}(4) \to \mathrm{SO}(6) \ (\text{two four state fermions}) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

This observation was first made in [89]. In what follows we will prove that these examples are not accidental and are the manifestation of a rather general principle relating epimorphisms of K and some $\mathrm{SO}(N)$, anti-unitary conjugations and the decomposition of the symmetric power of the representation considered onto irreducible components.

Before we proceed to the main results of this chapter let us mention briefly some properties of completely positive maps and Jamiołkowski-Choi isomorphism. According to Fact 2.2 every completely positive map $\Lambda \in \mathcal{CP}(\mathcal{H})$ admits a Kraus decomposition,

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} T_\alpha \rho T_\alpha^\dagger \,, \tag{4.13}$$

for $T_\alpha : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$. A Kraus decomposition is not unique yet there is a distinguished one associated with the spectral decomposition of the image of Λ under the Jamiołkowski-Choi isomorphism $\mathcal{J}$,

$$A = \mathcal{J}(\Lambda) = (\mathbb{I} \otimes \Lambda)(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) \ , \tag{4.14}$$

where

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |i\rangle|i\rangle \,, \tag{4.15}$$

is the maximally entangled state on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. If $\{|f_\alpha\rangle\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is the orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of A that correspond to (necessary non-negative) eigenvalues $\{\lambda_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$, we define

$$T_\alpha = \lambda_\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}} (\langle\Psi| \otimes \mathbb{I})(\mathbb{I} \otimes |f_\alpha\rangle) \ .$$

The notation used in the above formula, although commonly used, probably needs some elucidation. Observe that both $\langle\Psi|$ and $|f_\alpha\rangle$ are linear combinations of simple tensors (the former by its definition, the latter as an eigenvector of $A \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$). For simple tensors $|a\rangle \otimes |b\rangle$, $|c\rangle \otimes |d\rangle$ the corresponding formula reads

$$(\langle a| \otimes \langle b| \otimes \mathbb{I})(\mathbb{I} \otimes |c\rangle \otimes |d\rangle) = |d\rangle\langle a|\langle b|c\rangle \,,$$

which is indeed a linear operator on $\mathcal{H}$. It turns out that T_α indeed form a Kraus decomposition of Λ. The importance of this particular Kraus decomposition is twofold. Firstly, operators T_α are orthogonal to each other with respect to the standard Hilbert–Schmidt inner product on

[5] Consult Subsection 2.4.3 for the notation used here.

[6] Epimorphism between two groups is a homomorphism which is surjective.

$\mathrm{Lin}(\mathcal{H})$. Secondly, the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{A}$ is minimal. It is possible to express matrix coefficients of any $A \in \mathrm{Herm}_+(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ in terms of operators from Kraus decomposition (4.13) of the CP map corresponding to it.

$$\langle \psi_1 | \langle \psi_2 | A | \psi_3 \rangle | \psi_4 \rangle = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \psi_1 | T_\alpha \mathcal{K} \psi_2 \rangle \langle T_\alpha \mathcal{K} \psi_3 | \psi_4 \rangle \,, \tag{4.16}$$

where $\mathcal{K}$ is the complex conjugation in the basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ used to define the maximally entangled state (4.15) used in the definition of the Jamiołkowski-Choi isomorphism $\mathcal{J}$. An important class of CP maps is the class of quantum channels, i.e. CP maps that preserve traces, $\mathrm{tr}(\Lambda(\rho)) = \mathrm{tr}(\rho)$. On the level of Kraus decomposition this condition reduces to the requirement that $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} T_\alpha T_\alpha^\dagger = \mathbb{I}$. How is this condition realized on the level of the operator $A = \mathcal{J}(\Lambda) \in \mathrm{Herm}_+(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$? The necessary and sufficient condition turns out to be $\mathrm{tr}_1(A) = \mathbb{I}$. In what follows we focus on the situation when we have some non-negative A with only one nonzero eigenvalue. As discussed above, this situation allows us to choose only one Kraus operator in the decomposition of the corresponding Λ. If we assume that Λ is a quantum channel we get that the corresponding Kraus operator T_{α_0} is unitary,

$$T_{\alpha_0} T_{\alpha_0}^\dagger = \mathbb{I} \,.$$

Note that if $T_{\alpha_0} T_{\alpha_0}^\dagger \propto \mathbb{I}$ one can rescale the initial A ($A \to A' = cA$, $c > 0$) so that resulting T_{α_0} is unitary. By the virtue of Eq.(4.16), in the case of unitary T_{α_0} expectation value of A can be expressed in terms of anti-unitary operator $\theta = T_{\alpha_0} \mathcal{K}$,

$$\langle \psi | \langle \psi | A | \psi \rangle | \psi \rangle = |\langle \psi | \theta | \psi \rangle|^2 \,. \tag{4.17}$$

4.1.2. Classification of coherent states characterized by antiunitary conjugation

In this part, we characterize in terms of the representation theory of compact semi-simple Lie groups all situations in which equation (4.9) holds and explicit computation of the "correlation witness" $g^{\cup}(\rho)$ is possible (see Eq.(4.11)). Let us first introduce the concept of anti-unitary conjugation that 'detects correlations'. It will prove to be useful in our considerations.

Definition 4.2. Let Π be an irreducible representation of the compact semi-simple Lie group K. We shall say that an anti-unitary conjugation[7] operator $\theta : \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} \to \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ *detects correlations* if and only if it satisfies the following:

- θ is K-invariant, that is, $\Pi(k)\,\theta\,\Pi(k)^\dagger = \theta$ for each $k \in K$;
- The expectation value of θ vanishes exactly on classical states $\langle \psi | \theta \psi \rangle = 0$ if and only if $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}$.

We present our results in two theorems. The first relates the existence of anti-unitary conjugation detecting correlations to the decomposition of $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ into irreducible components. The second theorem connects this kind of anti-unitary conjugation with the existence of epimorphisms of the group K onto some orthogonal group.

Theorem 4.1. *Let K be a semi-simple, compact and connected Lie group. Let Π be some irreducible unitary representation of the group K in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ with the highest weight λ_0. The following two statements are equivalent:*

1. *There exist an anti-unitary operator $\theta : \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} \to \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ detecting correlations.*

[7] In [93, 114] the formulation of results was not precise. There it was stated that θ is just an antiunitary operator. Here we have corrected this mistake. The results from [93, 114] are not affected.

2. The following decomposition holds, $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) = \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0} \oplus \mathcal{H}^0$*, where* $\mathcal{H}^0$ *is the trivial representation of the group* K*.*

Proof. ($1 \longrightarrow 2$) Let $\theta = T\tilde{K}$ where T is an unitary operator and $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ is the operator of the complex conjugation is some fixed basis of $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$, say$\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$. Define an operator $A \in \mathrm{Herm}_+\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ as an image of the Jamiołkowski-Choi map (defined with respect to the basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$) of the CP map $\Lambda(\rho) = T\rho T^\dagger$ (see Eq.(4.14)). Matrix elements of A are given by the following formula (see Eq.(4.16)),

$$\langle\psi_1|\langle\psi_2|A|\psi_3\rangle|\psi_4\rangle = \langle\psi_1|T\mathcal{K}\psi_2\rangle\langle T\mathcal{K}\psi_3|\psi_4\rangle = \langle\psi_1|\theta\psi_2\rangle\langle\theta\psi_3|\psi_4\rangle\,.$$

We now claim that the operator A is proportional to $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$. Let us first notice that A is symmetric. This follows from the fact that θ is an antiunitary conjugation and thus is Hermitian (see Definition 4.1). Therefore we have

$$\langle\psi_1|\theta\psi_2\rangle = \langle\psi_2|\theta\psi_1\rangle,\ \langle\theta\psi_3|\psi_4\rangle = \langle\theta\psi_4|\psi_3\rangle\,.$$

The operator A is also non-negative which follows from the formula $\langle\psi_1|\langle\psi_2|A|\psi_1\rangle|\psi_2\rangle = |\langle\psi_1|\theta\psi_2\rangle|^2$. It is also K-invariant due to the K-invariance of θ. Therefore, by the virtue of Eq.(3.6) we have

$$A = a_{2\lambda_0}\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0} + \mathbb{V},$$

where $a_{2\lambda_0} \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{V}$ is the non-negative operator commuting with the action of K having the support on $\left(\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0}\right)^\perp \subset \mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$. By definition, A has only one eigenvector (see our remarks below Eq.(4.16)). Projection on this eigenvector cannot belong to $\mathcal{H}$ because the expectation value of θ vanishes on coherent states and consequently $A = \mathbb{V}$. On the other hand, by (3.11) and the definition of θ we have

$$|\langle\psi|\theta\psi\rangle| > 0 \Longleftrightarrow \left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}\right)(|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle) \neq 0\,.$$

The condition $|\langle\psi|\theta\psi\rangle| > 0$ is equivalent to $A|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle \neq 0$. Therefore we get that

$$A = c\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}\right)\,.$$

where $c > 0$. Consequently $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ is a projector onto one dimensional K-invariant subspace of $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$. By the fact that K is comapct and simply-connected this representation must be trivial (see Fact 2.19).

($2 \longrightarrow 1$) If $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) = \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0} \oplus \mathcal{H}^0$ then the operator $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ has rank 1 and is non-negative. If we apply to it the inverse of the Jamiołkowski-Choi isomorphism (with respect to some fixed basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$) we get $T = \mathcal{J}^{-1}\left(\mathbb{P}^0\right)$. By Eq.(4.16) we have

$$\langle\psi_1|\langle\psi_2|\mathbb{P}^0|\psi_3\rangle|\psi_4\rangle = \langle\psi_1|T\mathcal{K}\psi_2\rangle\langle T\mathcal{K}\psi_3|\psi_4\rangle\,, \tag{4.18}$$

where K is the complex conjugation in the basis $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$. We claim that the antilinear operator $\theta = T\mathcal{K}$ is proportional to the anti-unitary operator detecting correlations. The K-invariance of θ follows from (4.18) and K-invariance $\mathbb{P}^0$. Because of the decomposition $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) = \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0} \oplus \mathcal{H}^0$ and Eq.(4.18),

$$\langle\psi|\theta\psi\rangle = 0 \Longleftrightarrow |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}\,.$$

Moreover, operator θ is Hermitian, $\theta = \theta^\dagger$ which follows from the fact that $\mathbb{P}^0$ has support on $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$. The only thing that needs to be proved is that T can be rescaled to the unitary operator. This follows from the discussion of the relation between non-negative operators on the product of Hilbert spaces and quantum channels explained below Eq.(4.18). The necessary

and sufficient condition for T to be proportional to the unitary operator is $\mathrm{tr}_1\left(\mathbb{P}^0\right) = \mathbb{I}$. The operator $\mathbb{P}^0$ is the orthogonal projection onto one-dimensional trivial representation $\mathcal{H}^0$ in the decomposition of $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$. It can be thus written in the form of the integral with respect to the normalized Haar measure μ over the whole K [79].

$$\mathbb{P}^0 = \int_K \Pi\left(k\right) \otimes \Pi\left(k\right) d\mu\left(k\right) .$$

As a result we have

$$\mathrm{tr}_1\left(\mathbb{P}^0\right) = \int_K \mathrm{tr}\left(\Pi\left(k\right)\right) \Pi\left(k\right) d\mu\left(k\right) = \int_K \chi_{\lambda_0}\left(k\right) \Pi\left(k\right) d\mu\left(k\right) ,$$

where $\chi_{\lambda_0}\left(k\right)$ is the character of the representation Π. By the general representation theory of compact Lie groups [79], we have

$$\int_K \chi_{\lambda_0}\left(k\right) \Pi\left(k\right) d\mu\left(k\right) = \frac{\mathbb{I}}{N} ,$$

Therefore, the proof is completed. □

Note that in the assumptions of the above theorem there is no reference to the dimension N of the considered representation $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$. It is nevertheless clear that when $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ both statements (that are meant to be equivalent) are at the same time false[8].

The theorem proved above states that cases when operator $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$ has rank 1 correspond exactly to the appearance of anti-unitary conjugations that detect correlations. The following results shows that such cases are related to the existence of an epimorphism between the group K and one of three groups: $\mathrm{SO}\left(N\right)$ (for $N = \dim\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$), G_2 or $\mathrm{Spin}\left(7\right)$.

Theorem 4.2. *Let K be a semi-simple, compact and connected Lie group. The following two statements are equivalent*

1. *There exists an irreducible unitary representation Π of the group K in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ with the highest weight λ_0 ($N = \dim\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) > 2$). On $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ there exists an anti-unitary conjugation $\theta : \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} \to \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ detecting correlations.*
2. *There exists an epimorphism $h : K \to \mathrm{SO}\left(N\right)$, or $h : K \to G_2$ (the exceptional Lie group G_2 c.f. [115]) with $N = 7$, or $h : K \to \mathrm{Spin}\left(7\right)$ with $N = 8$.*

Proof. ($1 \longrightarrow 2$) Because θ is anti-unitary conjugation it is possible to choose the orthonormal basis $\left\{|i\rangle\right\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$ of $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ in such a way that each vector from the basis is an eigenvector of θ with an eigenvalue 1:

$$\theta|i\rangle = |i\rangle\ ,\ i = 1, \ldots, N\ .$$

In this basis θ acts as a complex conjugation,

$$\theta\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i |i\rangle\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{v}_i |i\rangle\ .$$

Let us denote by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\lambda_0}$ the real N subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ spanned by real combinations of vectors stabilized by θ. From the K-invariance of θ it follows that in the basis $\left\{|i\rangle\right\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$ operators $\Pi\left(k\right)$

[8] For the case $N = 1$ this statement follows form the fact that K is compact and simply-connected and therefore one dimensional representation must be trivial. The case of $N = 2$ follows from the fact that (by the virtue of semi-simplicity) K contains as a subgroup a group isomorphic to $\mathrm{SU}\left(2\right)$. Consequently for $N = 2$ the considered representation $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ is the defining represenation of $\mathrm{SU}\left(2\right)$in $\mathbb{C}^2$. In this representation we have $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathbb{C}^2\right)$.

are orthogonal. Because $\Pi : K \to \mathrm{U}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ is continuous, the image of a connected group K must be connected and therefore Π defines a homeomorphism $h : K \to \mathrm{SO}(N)$. Note that each vector representative $|\psi\rangle$ of a state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ can be decomposed onto its real and imaginary part,

$$|\psi\rangle = |u\rangle + i \cdot |w\rangle, \tag{4.19}$$

where $|u\rangle, |w\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\lambda_0}$. If $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is a coherent state we have

$$0 = \langle\psi|\theta\psi\rangle = \langle u|u\rangle - \langle v|v\rangle + 2i \cdot \langle u|v\rangle .$$

Therefore all coherent states are represented by vectors $|\psi\rangle = |u\rangle + i \cdot |w\rangle$, where $\langle u|u\rangle = \langle w|w\rangle$ and $\langle u|w\rangle = 0$. In particular this holds for a highest weight vector $|\psi_0\rangle = |u_0\rangle + i \cdot |w_0\rangle$ for some orthogonal and appropriately normalized $|u_0\rangle, |w_0\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\lambda_0}$. For $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle\langle\tilde{\psi}| \in \mathcal{M}$ let $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = |\tilde{u}\rangle + i \cdot |\tilde{w}\rangle$ be its vector representative. We claim that

$$|\tilde{u}\rangle = \Pi(k)\,|u\rangle\,,\ |\tilde{w}\rangle = \Pi(k)\,|w\rangle\,,$$

for some $k \in K$. Indeed, we must have $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle = \epsilon\Pi(k_1)\,|\psi_0\rangle (|\epsilon| = 1,\ k_1 \in K)$ due to the fact that $\mathcal{M}$ is an orbit of K. Because representation Π is nontrivial we can chose $k_2 \in K$ (actually k_2 belongs to the maximal torus $T \subset K$, see Subsection 2.4.2) such that $\epsilon|\psi_0\rangle = \Pi(k_2)\,|\psi_0\rangle$. Therefore, if we take $k = k_1 k_2$ we get the desired result (matrices corresponding to $\Pi(k)$ are real in the considered basis). Thus, it is possible to generate all pairs of orthonormal vectors by the action of $h(K)$ on vectors $|u_0\rangle$ and $|v_0\rangle$, i.e. $h(K)$ acts transitively on pairs of orthonormal vectors (for the formal definition of the action of a group see Subsection 2.3.3) from $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\lambda_0}$. Consequently, the group $h(K)$ acts transitively on $M = N - 1$ dimensional unit sphere sphere $\mathbb{S}_{N-1}$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\lambda_0}$. This action is also effective[9] because $h(K)$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}(N)$ whose action on $\mathbb{S}_{N-1}$ is effective. This fact suffices to prove that $h(K)$ equals $\mathrm{SO}(N)$, G_2 or $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$. In order to see this, we refer to the classical result of Montgomery and Samelson [116] that classifies all compact and connected Lie groups acting transitively and effectively on N-dimensional spheres. The list of such groups is short and consists of seven cases: $\mathrm{SO}(N)$ itself, its three proper subgroups $\mathrm{SU}\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)$, $\mathrm{Sp}\left(\frac{N}{4}\right)$ and $\mathrm{Sp}(1) \times \mathrm{Sp}\left(\frac{N}{4}\right)$ (where $\mathrm{Sp}(\cdot)$ denotes the compact symplectic group[10]), $G_2 \subset \mathrm{SO}(7)$, $\mathrm{Spin}(7) \subset \mathrm{SO}(8)$, and $\mathrm{Spin}(9) \subset \mathrm{SO}(16)$. We first consider the last three "exceptional" cases. Groups G_2, $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ and $\mathrm{Spin}(9)$ act transitively on, respectively, 6-, 7- and 15-dimensional spheres. Those actions come from the following (faithful) representations: defining representation of G_2, eight-dimensional spinor representation of $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ and 16 dimensional spinor representation of $\mathrm{Spin}(9)$. Actions of G_2 and $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ are transitive on orthonormal pairs of vectors (see [115], page 32). Therefore those groups are permissible. On the other hand, it is known [28] that the 16-dimensional representation of $\mathrm{Spin}(9)$ does not have the desired property. Let us now consider the special unitary and symplectic subgroups of $\mathrm{SO}(N)$. Those groups can appear only when 2 (in the case of $\mathrm{SU}\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)$) or 4 (in cases of $\mathrm{Sp}\left(\frac{N}{4}\right)$ and $\mathrm{Sp}(1) \times \mathrm{Sp}\left(\frac{N}{4}\right)$) are divisors of N. Therefore when N is odd the proof is finished. Now assume that 2 or 4 divides N. Since $h(K)$ acts transitively on orthonormal pairs of vectors, a stabilizer subgroup $\mathrm{Stab}(|u_0\rangle) \subset h(K)$ must act transitively on

$$\mathbb{S}_{N-2} = \mathbb{S}_{N-1} \cap |u_0\rangle^{\perp},$$

where $|u_0\rangle^{\perp}$ is the orthogonal complement of $|u_0\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{R}}^{\lambda_0}$. We can now apply the theorem of Montgomery and Samelson for the dimension $N - 1$. Since $N - 1$ is now odd, we infer that we have three possibilities

[9] The action of the group K on a set X is effective if and only if give two different elements of a group, $k_1, k_2 \in K$ there exist an element $x \in X$ such that $k_1.x \neq k_2.x$.

[10] The compact symplectic group $\mathrm{Sp}(N)$ is defined by $\mathrm{U}(2N) \cap \mathrm{Sp}(2N, \mathbb{C})$, where $\mathrm{Sp}(2N, \mathbb{C})$ is a group preserving the standard anti-linear form on $\mathbb{C}^{2N}$.

1. $\mathrm{Stab}\left(|u_0\rangle\right) = \mathrm{Spin}\left(7\right)$, $N = 8$;
2. $\mathrm{Stab}\left(|u_0\rangle\right) = \mathrm{Spin}\left(9\right) \subset SO\left(16\right)$, $N = 16$;
3. $\mathrm{Stab}\left(|u_0\rangle\right) = \mathrm{SO}\left(N-1\right)$, N - arbitrary.

In the first case we have that $\mathrm{Stab}\left(|u_0\rangle\right) = \mathrm{Spin}\left(7\right)$ must be a subgroup of $h\left(K\right)$ which is either $SU\left(4\right)$, or $Sp\left(2\right)$ or $\mathrm{Sp}\left(1\right) \times \mathrm{Sp}\left(2\right)$. These cases can be however rejected since the equality

$$\dim\left(\mathrm{Stab}\left(|u_0\rangle\right)\right) + \dim\left(\mathbb{S}_{N-1}\right) = \dim\left(h\left(K\right)\right) , \tag{4.20}$$

is not satisfied. In the second case we have that $\mathrm{Stab}\left(|u_0\rangle\right) = \mathrm{Spin}\left(9\right)$ a subgroup of $h\left(K\right)$ which is either $SU\left(8\right)$, or $Sp\left(4\right)$ or $\mathrm{Sp}\left(4\right) \times \mathrm{Sp}\left(2\right)$. The cases of $Sp\left(4\right)$ or $\mathrm{Sp}\left(4\right) \times \mathrm{Sp}\left(2\right)$ can be disregarded again by the virtue of (4.20). The case of $\mathrm{Stab}\left(|u_0\rangle\right) = SU\left(8\right)$ is not obvious but form the discussion contained on page 12 of [117] it follows that $\mathrm{Spin}\left(9\right) \cap SU\left(8\right) \neq \mathrm{Spin}\left(9\right)$ and we have to reject also this possibility. Consequently we have to consider the last possibility: $\mathrm{Stab}\left(|u_0\rangle\right) = \mathrm{SO}\left(N-1\right)$. As a consequence of (4.20), we have

$$\dim\left(h\left(K\right)\right) \geq \frac{\left(N-1\right)\left(N-2\right)}{2} = \dim\left(\mathrm{SO}\left(\mathrm{N}-1\right)\right) .$$

Since the dimensions of $\mathrm{SU}\left(\frac{N}{2}\right)$, $\mathrm{Sp}\left(\frac{N}{4}\right)$ and $\mathrm{Sp}\left(1\right) \times \mathrm{Sp}\left(\frac{N}{4}\right)$ are, respectively, $\frac{N^2}{4} - 1$, $\frac{N}{4}\left(\frac{N}{2}+1\right)$ and $\frac{N}{4}\left(\frac{N}{2}+1\right)+3$ we can exclude those groups. At the end, we conclude that only possibilities are that $h(K) = \mathrm{SO}\left(N\right)$, $h(K) = G_2$ (when $N = 7$) or $h(K) = \mathrm{Spin}\left(7\right)$ (when $N = 8$).

$(2 \longrightarrow 1)$ We treat groups $\mathrm{SO}\left(N\right)$, G_2 and $\mathrm{Spin}\left(7\right)$ together. We consider defining representations of $\mathrm{SO}\left(N\right)$ and G_2 and the eight-dimensional spinor representation of $\mathrm{Spin}\left(7\right)$. We shall show that symmetric powers of those irreducible faithful representations (clearly those are also irreducible representations of the group K) decompose into two ingredients: $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) = \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0} \oplus \mathcal{H}^0$. Then, combining this with Theorem 4.1, we conclude the existence of the anti-unitary operator θ that detects coherent states for each of considered representations. To prove the above decomposition, we note that each representation respects the Euclidean structure in the relevant $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}$ (when viewed as subgroups of $\mathrm{SO}\left(N\right)$, $\mathrm{SO}\left(7\right)$ and $\mathrm{SO}\left(8\right)$ accordingly) and therefore we have a following chain of equivalences of representations

$$\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) \approx \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}\right) \approx \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathrm{SEnd}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}\right) , \tag{4.21}$$

where $\mathrm{SEnd}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}\right)$ is the vectors space of symmetric real operators on $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}$. The action of the relevant group $h\left(K\right)$ on $X \in \mathrm{SEnd}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}\right)$ is via conjugation,

$$X \to g.X = gXg^T ,$$

where $g \in h\left(K\right) \subset \mathrm{SO}\left(N\right)$. The decomposition $\mathrm{SEnd}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}\right)$ onto irreducible components of $h\left(K\right)$ reads

$$\mathrm{SEnd}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}\right) \approx \mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{I} \oplus \mathrm{SEnd}_0\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}\right) , \tag{4.22}$$

where $\mathrm{Lin}_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{I}$ is the one dimensional trivial representation spanned by identity operator and and $\mathrm{SEnd}_0\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}\right)$ denote the real vector vectors space of symmetric traceless operators on $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}$. The component $\mathrm{SEnd}_0\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}\right)$ is irreducible which follows from the transitivity of the action of the each group on pairs of orthonormal vectors. Taking into account (4.21) and (4.22) and using the fact that complexification of a real irreducible representation remains irreducible we get $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) = \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0} \oplus \mathcal{H}^0$ which finishes the proof. □

From the proof of Theorem 4.2 we get the following Corollary.

Corollary 4.1. *Let K be a semi-simple, compact and connected Lie group irreducibly represented, via representation Π, in Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$. Assume that on $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ there exists an anti-unitary conjugation $\theta : \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} \to \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ detecting correlations. Let $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the N dimensional subspace subspace spanned by real combinations of vectors satisfying $\theta|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$. Then the following holds*

- *The representation Π preserves $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}$, i.e. $\Pi(k)$ are orthogonal in the orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}$.*
- *Given two pairs of orthogonal vectors from $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}$, $(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$, $(|\phi_1\rangle, |\phi_2\rangle)$, there exists an element $k \in K$ such that*

$$|\phi_1\rangle = \Pi(k)\,|\psi_1\rangle\,,\ |\phi_2\rangle = \Pi(k)\,|\psi_2\rangle\,.$$

In other words the group K acts transitively, via representation Π on pairs of orthonormal vectors from $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Let us now remark on the obtained results.

- The list of groups appearing in point two of Theorem (4.2) consists precisely of groups appearing in Theorem 3.8.1 in [28]. In the cited paper Alexander Klyachko considers the generalization of the concept of entanglement based on the analogies between some aspect of the entanglement theory and geometric invariant theory (see Section 1.1). The groups $\mathrm{SO}(N)$, G_2 and $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ correspond precisely to irreducible representations of the group K for which "all unstable[11] states are coherent". This is not entirely accidental as "systems in which all unstable states are coherent' considered by Klyachko in his paper can be, in fact, equivalently characterized by our Theorem 4.1.
- The existence of the anti-unitary conjugation $\theta : \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} \to \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ commuting with the representation Π of the group K is one of the equivalent conditions [82] that ensure that representation Π is real, i.e. there exist a basis of $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ such all operators $\Pi(k)$ in this basis are orthogonal. We have used this fact in the course of the proof of (4.2).
- In the proof of Theorem (4.2), we referred to the classical work by Montgomery and Samelson [116]. Although it may seem to be a trick from a rather 'high floor', we would like to stress that the problem is not as easy as it may seem at the first sight. It turns out that when N is even, there are proper subgroups of $\mathrm{SO}(N)$ that act transitively on $\mathbb{S}_{N-1}$ (this fact is directly related to the classification of the holonomy[12] groups of irreducible non-locally symmetric Riemannian spaces [118]). Nevertheless, our assumption about the existence of an "anti-unitary conjugation detecting correlations" is strong enough to guarantee that the image of the homomorphism we consider is the whole $\mathrm{SO}(N)$, G_2 or $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$.

We presented the group-theoretical conditions for the cases when the anti-unitary conjugation detecting correlations exists and it is possible to compute $g^{\cup}(\rho)$ (see Eq. (4.10)) exactly. Our results reproduce all physically-relevant cases where anti-unitary conjugation was known to

[11] The notion of "unstable states" in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ is related to the action of the complexified group $G = K^{\mathbb{C}}$ in $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$. For details see [28, 38, 39].

[12] The holonomy group of a connected Riemannian manifold $\mathcal{M}$ of dimension N is a subgroup of the orthogonal group $\mathrm{O}(N)$ defined by the Levi-Civita connection on $\mathcal{M}$ in the following way. To every smooth loop $\gamma : [0,1] \to \mathcal{M}$ based at $x \in \mathcal{M}$ a Levi-Civita connection associates a unique parellel transoprt $P_\gamma : T_x\mathcal{M} \to T_x\mathcal{M}$. The holonomy group $\mathrm{Hol}_x(\mathcal{M})$ based at $x \in \mathcal{M}$ is a group generated by pararell transport maps associated to all loops,

$$\mathrm{Hol}_x(\mathcal{M}) = \{\, P_\gamma |\ \gamma : [0,1] \to \mathcal{M},\, \gamma(0) = \gamma(1) = x\} \ .$$

Given any two points $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ we have $\mathrm{Hol}_y(\mathcal{M}) = g_{yx}\mathrm{Hol}_x(\mathcal{M})\, g_{yx}^T$ where $g_{xy} \in \mathrm{O}(N)$. Therefore the holonomy group is defined uniqelly, up to isomorphism. For the comprehensive introduction to the concept of holonomy group see [77].

exist (c.f. Eq.(4.12)). In the next section we apply the obtained results to study "non-Gaussian" correlations in fermionic systems, a type of correlations that does not appear on the list (4.12).

4.2. Classical simulation of Fermionic Linear Optics augmented with noisy ancillas

For any model of quantum computation it is vital to characterize its computational power. Probably the most important practical question is how a given model compares to universal classical, respectively quantum, computation[13]. If protocols allowed by the model are efficiently simulable on a classical computer, the corresponding physical system may be accessible to numerical studies, but is unlikely to be a suitable candidate for a quantum computer. On the other hand, simulability by quantum circuits ensures that the underlying physics can be effectively studied using a quantum computer [120]. Lastly, if the resources provided by the model enable one to implement a universal quantum computation, the corresponding physical system is a candidate for the realization of a quantum computer. In this part we apply result of the previous section to study the problem of classical simulation of model of quantum computation in which Fermionic Linear Optics (FLO) is augmented with noisy ancilla state. In this model of quantum computation the auxiliary state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ from the d-mode Fock space is a parameter of the model. If ρ belong to the convex hull, $\mathcal{M}_g^c$, of pure Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g$ (see Subsection 3.1.5) than the corresponding model of computation is classically simulable [22]. In turns out that using the methods developed in the previous section we will be able to characterize the set of convex-Gaussian fermionic states $\mathcal{M}_g^c$ in the first nontrivial case of $d = 4$ fermionic modes.

The section is structured as follows. In Subsection 4.2.1 we introduce the model of quantum computation based on FLO augmented with noisy ancilla states and present the relation between FLO and the model of Topological Quantum Computation (TQC) based on braiding of Ising anyons. In Subsection 4.2.2 we present the analytical characterization of four mode convex-Gaussian states in four mode fermionic Fock space thus partially solving the problem of classical simulation of above mentioned model of computation (in particular we solve an open problem recently posed in [22]). We also derive the analogue of Schmidt decomposition for pure fermionic states with fixed parity in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^4\right)$. This allows us to describe the geometry of the inclusion $\mathcal{M}_g^c \subset \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$. We conclude our considerations in Subsection 4.2.3 where we discuss importance of the obtained results to the computation model based on ancilla-assisted FLO. Throughout the section we will use the notation from Subsection 3.1.5.

[13] In the circuit model of classical computation a discrete set of gates G (elementary operations that can be performed on a input string $x \in 2^{\{1,\ldots,N\}}$) is said to be *universal* if and only if it is possible to compute arbitrary function

$$f : 2^{\{1,\ldots,N\}} \to \{0,1\} ,$$

via the composition of elements from $\mathcal{G}$ (for arbitrary natural number n).

In the circuit model of quantum computing a finite set of gates $\mathcal{G} \subset S\mathrm{U}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^2\right)^{\otimes L}\right)$ is said to be *computationally universal* if by product of elements from $\mathcal{G}$ we can aproximate arbitrary unitary operation $U \in \mathrm{SU}\left(\left(\mathbb{C}^2\right)^{\otimes L}\right)$. The foundations quantum computation are beyound the scope of this thesis. For the comprehensive introduction to this exiting field of study see [49] or [119].

4.2.1. Ancilla-assisted Fermionic Linear Optics

Many physically motivated models of quantum computation are defined by specifying the available set of initial states, gates and measurements [121, 122]. The computation model based on Fermionic Linear Optics was introduced in [123]. The allowed operations of the model are:

i. Preparation of the Fock vacuum $|0\rangle\langle 0| \in \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$;
ii. Measurement of the occupation numbers $\hat{n}_k = a_k^\dagger a_k = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{I} + ic_{2k-1}c_{2k}\right)$ for any mode $k = 1, \ldots, d$;
iii. Evolution under the von-Neumann equation, $\frac{d}{dt}\rho = -i\left[H,\, \rho\right]$, for time t. The Hamiltonian $H = i\sum_{k,l=1}^{2N} h_{kl}c_k c_l$ is an arbitrary Hamiltonian quadratic in Majorana operators. This operation is equivalent to application of arbitrary parity preserving Bogolyubov transformation $U \in \mathcal{B}$ (see Eq.(3.46)) on a state ρ.

Operations (i), (ii) and (iii) can be preformed in arbitrary order and may depend upon measurement results obtained during the previous stages of the computation. The protocol concludes with the final measurement whose (binary) outcome is the result of the computation. The above model of computation can be efficiently simulated in a polynomial time on a probabilistic classical computer (a classical computer having access to random bits). The proof (see [123] for details) relies on the flowing properties of the model

- Efficient encoding of Gaussian states[14] $\text{Gauss} \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$. Gaussian states in d mode fermionic systems are fully described by their correlation matrix $M\left(\rho\right)$ (c.f. Eq.(3.43)), with $O\left(d^2\right)$ elements.
- FLO transformations (3) map Gaussian states onto Gaussian states, with the efficient update rule. Action of $U \in \mathcal{B}$ induces the orthogonal transformation on $M\left(\rho\right)$ (given by Eq.(3.47)) that can be evaluated in $O\left(d^3\right)$ steps.
- Efficient read-out of measurement probability distributions occupation number. Thanks to Fermionic Wick's theorem [22, 23] the probability of measuring the population in fermionic modes can be evaluated in $O\left(d^3\right)$ steps. Furthermore, number operator measurements transform Gaussian states onto Gaussian states.

Thee Fermionic Linear Optics model of quantum computation presented above is the fermionic analogue of well-know bosonic linear optics [124, 125]. Fermionic linear optics describes systems of non-interacting fermions, i.e. fermionic systems that can be described exactly by Bogolyubov mean field theory. The model of computation based on FLO alone is not computationally universal and can, as described above, be effectively simulated by a classical probabilistic computer [91, 123]. Nevertheless, the physics beyond FLO is rich and captures a number of systems of interest for condensed matter physics, including Kitaev's Majorana chain [126], honeycomb model [127], $\nu = 5/2$ fractional Quantum Hall systems [128]. These systems possess a topological order and can be used as fault-tolerant quantum memories [129] or Topological Quantum Computation (TQC) with Ising anyons [127]. This motivates an interest in extending FLO in such a way that the resulting model will become computationally universal. One of the possible extensions is the model in which FLO is augmented with a noisy ancilla state. In this model, introduced in [22], the traditional model of FLO is extended by introducing additional fermionic modes in which, at the beginning of computation, one stores certain number of copies of a, perhaps noisy, ancilla state. Initial state of the system in the original "computational" modes remains the vacuum state and the class of allowed operations remains intact. Formally, the model (i-iii) is extended by the following operation.

[14] Recall that the class of mixed Gaussian states consists of states satisfying Eq.(3.44). In general Gaussian states form a subset of convex-Gaussian states, $\text{Gauss} \subset \mathcal{M}_g^c$.

iv. Multiple usage of the even[15] ancilla state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^m\right)\right)$ that is stored in auxiliary m fermionic modes. If k auxiliary states are available, the total Hilbert space of the system becomes[16]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^m\right)\right)^{\otimes k} \approx \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d+m\cdot k}\right) \tag{4.23}$$

and we allow arbitrary operations of the form (2) and (3) to be performed on the initial state of the total system of the form $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho^{\otimes k}$.

This model of computation is analogous to other ancilla-assisted models of quantum computation such as ancilla-assisted computation with Clifford gates [130, 131] or ancilla-assisted TQC with Ising anyons [24]. It will be convenient for us to describe the model of TQC with Ising anyons in more detail. This model is defined essentially in the same manner as FLO [24]. The only difference is in the step (iii) of the model:

iii'. Application of the braiding unitary operation $B_{p,q} \in \mathcal{B}$ defined by

$$B_{p,q} = \exp\left(-\frac{\pi}{4} c_p c_q\right) \,,\, 1 \leq p < q \leq 2d \tag{4.24}$$

The rule (iii') changes the model dramatically - it distinguishes one particular basis of a single-particle Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^d$. We will not discuss here in detail the motivation beyond (iii'). Let us only mention that $B_{p,q}$ represents nonabelian exchange between "particles" associated to Majorana operators c_k. The operation (4.24) models [24] a "topologically protected" operation of exchange of excitations in two dimensional electron gas in Fractional quantum hall regime characterized by the filling factor $\nu = \frac{5}{2}$. The ancilla-assisted TQC is defined by extending the model by the rule (iv).

In [24] it was shown that ancilla-assisted TQC with Ising anyons can be promoted to the universal model of computation if one has access to the following ancilla states[17]

- $\rho_1 \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^2\right)\right)$ such that $\text{tr}\left(\rho_1 |a_4\rangle\langle a_4|\right) \geq 0.86$, where $|a_4\rangle\langle a_4| \in \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^2\right)\right)$ is some fixed pure state;
- $\rho_2 \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^-_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^2\right)\right)$ such that $\text{tr}\left(\rho_2 |a_8\rangle\langle a_8|\right) \geq 0.62$, where $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8| \in \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^4\right)\right)$ is some fixed pure state (see below).

In [22] it was proven that for $m \leq 3$ every pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^m\right)\right)$ is Gaussian. Therefore, having access to FLO we can always generate the state $|a_4\rangle\langle a_4|$ from the vacuum.

Let us now come back to the discussion of ancilla-assisted FLO. The discussion above shows that, depending on the properties of the auxiliary state ρ, it may be possible to implement, with the help of traditional FLO operations, gates that are necessary for computational universality on registers describing the actual computation (this follows from the fact that the class of operation allowed by TQC with Ising anyons is a subclass of operations allowed by FLO).

[15] For the definition of even fermionic states see Subsection 3.1.5.

[16] This isomorphism is basis-dependent. The linear mapping $\phi : \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1}\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right) \to \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1+d_2}\right)$ defined on a simple tensors by

$$\phi\left(|n_1, \ldots, n_d\rangle \otimes |n_{1'}, \ldots, n_{d'_2}\rangle\right) = |n_1, \ldots, n_d, n_{1'}, \ldots, n_{d'_2}\rangle \,,$$

gives an isomorphism $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1}\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_2}\right) \approx \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d_1+d_2}\right)$.

[17] By "universal model of computation" we understand the following: it is possible to approximate arbitrary unitary operator $U \in \text{SU}\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ if we can perform operations (ii) and (iii') on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^{d+k_1\cdot 2+k_2\cdot 4}\right)$ provided initially the state of the system is $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \rho_1^{\otimes k_1} \otimes \rho_2^{\otimes k_2}$, for suitable k_1, k_2.

On the other hand the computation model (i-iv) was shown [22] to be effectively classically simulable if the auxiliary state ρ is convex-Gaussian, i.e.

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \,,$$

where $|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \in \mathcal{M}_g$. The simulation scheme consists of sampling pure Gaussian states $\{|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|\}$ according to the probability distribution $\{p_i\}$ followed by the classical simulation of the evolution of Gaussian states described above. This is the reason why the characterization of the convex-Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g^c$ is important for this model of computation. We would like to remark that convex-Gaussian ancilla states lead to an effectively classically simulable model also when one replaces FLO with its dissipative counterpart, recently introduced in [91]. For this reason results presented in this section are also valid for the dissipative FLO.

4.2.2. Analytical characterization of four mode fermionic convex-Gaussian states

In this subsection we characterize analytically the set of convex-Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g^c$ in the first nontrivial case of $d = 4$ modes. From the discussion given in the previous subsection it follows that this result is relevant for the classical simulability of the model of computation in which FLO is assisted by noisy ancilla state (convex-Gaussianity of the ancilla state implies the classical simulability of the model). In this subsection we state and prove a number of technical results. As a byproduct of our considerations we also solve an open problem posed recently in the paper of de Melo et. al. [22]. The implications of obtained results to the above mentioned model of quantum computation will be discussed in the next section.

Fact 4.2. *([22]) Any even pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ for $d \leq 3$ is Gaussian.*

Before we present our results let us recall (c.f. subsection 3.1.5) that all pure fermionic Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g$ are even, i.e. they commute with the total parity operator Q. Consequently operators belonging to the convex hull $\mathcal{M}_g^c$ are also even operators. In what follows we will need the following decomposition of even operators $X \in \text{Herm}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$,

$$X = \alpha_0 \mathbb{I} + \sum_{k=1}^{d} i^k \sum_{1 \leq l_1 < l_2 < \ldots < l_{2k} \leq 2d} \alpha_{l_1 l_2 \ldots l_{2k}} c_{l_1} c_{l_2} \ldots c_{l_{2k}} \,, \tag{4.25}$$

where all the coefficients α_0 and $\alpha_{l_1 l_2 \ldots l_{2k}}$ are real.

Let $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^4\right)\right)$ be an arbitrary four mode even mixed state having the decomposition (4.25). Let

$$\rho_+ = \mathbb{P}_+ \rho \mathbb{P}_+ \,,\; \rho_- = \mathbb{P}_- \rho \mathbb{P}_-$$

denote restrictions of ρ to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^-\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$, respectively. By $\tilde{X}$ we denote the "complex conjugate" of the operator X, i.e., an operator constructed from X by changing all i to $-i$ in the decomposition (4.25). Let us introduce non-negative functions C_+ and C_- that are the analogues of Uhlmann-Wotters concurrence from the previous section. They are defined by

$$C_\pm(\rho) = \max\left\{0,\, \lambda_1^\pm - \sum_{k=2}^{8} \lambda_k^\pm\right\}, \tag{4.26}$$

where $\left(\lambda_1^\pm,\, \lambda_2^\pm, \ldots,\, \lambda_8^\pm\right)$ denote non-increasingly ordered eigenvalues of the operator $\sqrt{\rho_\pm \tilde{\rho}_\pm}$.

Theorem 4.3. *Convex-Gaussianity of $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^4\right)\right)$ is characterized by the values of these generalized concurrences,*

$$\rho \text{ is convex-Gaussian } \iff C_+(\rho) = C_-(\rho) = 0\,. \tag{4.27}$$

Moreover, an arbitrary four mode convex-Gaussian state $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_g^c$ can be represented as a convex combination

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{i=\mathcal{N}} p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|\,,$$

of at most $\mathcal{N} = 16$ of pure Gaussian states $|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \in \mathcal{M}_g$.

Proof. Let us first note that pure fermionic Gaussian states have a fixed parity. In other words: $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{M}_g^+ \cup \mathcal{M}_g^-$, where $\mathcal{M}_g^\pm \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ (see Figure 3.6). For this reason it is enough to consider the problem of convex-Gaussianity separately on $\text{Fock}_\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. In other words an even state ρ is convex-Gaussian if and only if both ρ_+ and ρ_- are convex-Gaussian. We will show below that there exist antiunitary operators $\theta_\pm$, each acting on $\text{Fock}_\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^4\right)$, such that

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_g^\pm \iff C_\pm\left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right) = |\langle\psi|\theta_\pm\psi\rangle| = 0\,. \tag{4.28}$$

We can now use the Uhlmann-Wotters construction and results of the previews section to compute the convex roof extension of $C_\pm$,

$$C_\pm(\sigma) = \inf_{\sum |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| = \sigma} \left(\sum_i C_\pm\left(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|\right)\right)$$

for σ a non-negative operator on $\text{Fock}_\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^4\right)$. From the definition of the convex roof extension and the discussion above we have that ρ is convex-Gaussian if and only if

$$C_+(\rho_+) = C_-(\rho_-) = 0\,.$$

Explicit formulas for $C_\pm(\rho_\pm)$ are given by (4.26), where $\left(\lambda_1^\pm, \lambda_2^\pm, \ldots, \lambda_8^\pm\right)$ denote non-increasingly ordered eigenvalues of the operator $\sqrt{\rho_\pm\theta_\pm\rho_\pm\theta_\pm}$ (see Eq.(4.11)). From Fact 4.1 it follows that for convex-Gaussian states supported in $\text{Fock}_\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^4\right)$ we need at most $\mathcal{N} = 8 = \dim\left(\text{Fock}_\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^4\right)\right)$ pure Gaussian states in the convex decomposition. Consequently, for an arbitrary convex-Gaussian state in $\text{Fock}\left(\mathbb{C}^4\right)$ this number equals $\mathcal{N} = 16$.

The existence of antiunitary operators $\theta_\pm$ follows from group-theoretical interpretation of pure Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g^\pm$ presented in Subsection 3.1.5. The group of Bogolyubov transformations $\mathcal{B}$ is precisely the image of a representation of $\text{Spin}\left(2d\right)$, a compact semi-simple Lie group. The Hilbert space $\text{Fock}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ decomposes into two irreducible representations of $\text{Spin}\left(2d\right)$: $\text{Fock}_+\left(\mathbb{C}^m\right)$ and $\text{Fock}_-\left(\mathbb{C}^m\right)$ respectively. Sets of pure Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g^\pm \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^\pm\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ are precisely the highest weight orbits of this group in $\text{Spin}\left(2d\right)$. Semi-simple compact Lie groups K and irreducible representations $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ admitting an antiunitary operator $\theta : \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} \to \mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ detecting the orbit through the highest-weight vector had been classified in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. In order to guarantee the existence of such θ it suffices to check that the following decomposition holds:

$$\text{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right) = \mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0} \oplus \mathcal{H}^0\,, \tag{4.29}$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0}$ is an irreducible representation of K characterized by the highest weight $2\lambda_0$, and $\mathcal{H}^0$ is a trivial (one dimensional) representation of K. In our case we have $K = \text{Spin}\left(8\right)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ or $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^-\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. For these particular representations the decomposition (4.29) indeed holds (This follows from Eq. (3.52), see also, for example [100]) and thus existence

of Spin (8)-invariant antiunitaries $\theta_\pm$ is thus guaranteed. We conclude the proof of (4.27) by showing that

$$\theta_\pm X \theta_\pm = \tilde{X}$$

for every operator X supported in either $\mathrm{Fock}_+(\mathbb{C}^4)$ or $\mathrm{Fock}_-(\mathbb{C}^4)$. We present here a proof only for the case when X has a support in $\mathrm{Fock}_+(\mathbb{C}^4)$. The desired property of θ_+ follows from its invariance under the action of Spin (8). Because Spin (8) is generated by anti-Hermitian operators $c_i c_j$, it follows that $c_i c_j \theta_+ = \theta_+ c_i c_j$ for every pair of Majorana operators. Using the fact that θ_+ satisfies (as every antiunitary operator) $\theta_+^2 = \mathbb{I}$, $\theta i = -i\theta$ and noting that every operator X with support in $\mathrm{Fock}_+(\mathbb{C}^4)$ is an even operator (and thus has a decomposition (3.6)) proves $\theta_\pm X \theta_\pm = \tilde{X}$. □

Let us remark on the result given above.

- The maximal number of pure Gaussian $\mathcal{N} = 16$ needed to represent arbitrary four mode convex-Gaussian state is much smaller then the upper bound $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} = 48$ obtained in [22].
- It is natural to ask whether similar results hold also for number of modes greater than 4. Unfortunately the decomposition (4.29) does not hold for the symmetric product of Spin $(2d)$ representations $\mathcal{H}^{\pm}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ for $d > 4$.

Example 4.1. Let us now apply Theorem 4.3 to give the noise threshold p_{cr} above which a depolarization of the state $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8| \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{even}}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}(\mathbb{C}^4))$ becomes convex-Gaussian. In other words we consider a state

$$\rho(p) = (1-p)\,|a_8\rangle\langle a_8| + p\frac{\mathbb{I}}{16}\,, \tag{4.30}$$

where $p \in [0,\,1]$, $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator on $\mathrm{Fock}_+(\mathbb{C}^4)$. The pure state $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8|$ is defined by

$$|a_8\rangle\langle a_8| = \frac{1}{16}\left(\mathbb{I}+S_1\right)\left(\mathbb{I}+S_2\right)\left(\mathbb{I}+S_3\right)\left(\mathbb{I}+Q\right)\,, \tag{4.31}$$

where $S_1 = -c_1c_2c_5c_6$, $S_2 = -c_2c_3c_6c_7$, $S_3 = -c_1c_2c_3c_4$. The state $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8|$ can be used to implement a CNOT gate that is needed to promote FLO to be computationally universal [22, 24]. The problem of finding p_{cr} was considered in [22] where authors showed that $\rho(p)$ is non-convex-Gaussian for $p \leq p_1^* = \frac{8}{15}$ and is convex-Gaussian for $p \geq p_2^* = \frac{8}{9}$. Application of criterion (4.27) to (4.30) is straightforward because $\tilde{\rho}(p) = \rho(p)$. Simple algebra shows that $\rho(p)$ is convex-Gaussian if and only if $p \geq \frac{8}{11} = p_{cr}$. This result is particularly interesting as it opens a possibility for existence of more noise-resilient protocols of distillation of the state pure $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8|$ from copies of a noisy state $\rho(p)$ via FLO or TQC with Ising Anyons (protocol based on TQC introduced in [24] works for $p \leq 0.4$). The Figure 4.1 presents the comparison of results presented here to the ones given in [22].

Insights from the proofs of results given in the previous section allow us to describe the geometry of the pure-Gaussian and convex-Gaussian states in four mode fermionic Fock space. We present our results in the form of two technical Lemmas. For simplicity we restrict our considerations to the subspace $\mathcal{H}^{+}_{\mathrm{Fock}}(\mathbb{C}^4)$. The analogous statements hold also for states defined on $\mathcal{H}^{-}_{\mathrm{Fock}}(\mathbb{C}^4)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^{+}_{\mathrm{Fock}}(\mathbb{C}^4)\right)$. Let $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{+}_{\mathrm{Fock}}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ be a normalized vector representing the state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. Up to a global phase $|\psi\rangle$ can be expressed as a combination of orthogonal vectors representing Gaussian states: $|\psi_G\rangle$ and $\theta_+|\psi_G\rangle$,*

$$|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{1-p^2}|\psi_G\rangle + p\theta_+|\psi_G\rangle\,, \tag{4.32}$$

where $p \in \left[0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right]$ and $|\psi_G\rangle = U|0\rangle$ for $U \in \mathcal{B}$. The expression (4.32) can be considered as a generalized Schmidt decomposition[18]*.*

[18] It is important to remark that in (4.32) the phase of $|\psi_G\rangle$ *does* matter (unless $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is itself Gaussian).



Figure 4.1. The properties of a state $\rho(p)$ as a function of the depolarization parameter p. The state $\rho(p)$ is not convex-Gaussian for $p \in [0, p_{\rm cr})$ and is convex-Gaussian for $p \in [p_{\rm cr}, 1]$, where $p_{\rm cr} = \frac{8}{11}$. For $p \in \left[0, \frac{4}{10}\right)$ the state $\rho(p)$ can be used to distill [24], via TQC which is a subset of FLO, pure states $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8|$that can be subsequently used to make FLO compuationally universal. The parameters $p_1^* = \frac{8}{15}$ and $p_2^* = \frac{8}{9}$ are respectivelly lower and upper bounds for $p_{\rm cr}$ obtained in [22].

Proof. The proof is given in the Section 8.2 Appendix (see page 8.2). □

Let us note that $p = 0$ in Eq.(4.32) corresponds to the set of pure Gaussian states in $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\rm Fock}(\mathbb{C}^4)\right)$. On the other hand states for which $p = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ belong to the orbit $\mathcal{B}$ through the state $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8|$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let* $F(\rho,\sigma) = \left(\mathrm{tr}\left[\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho}\sigma\sqrt{\rho}}\right]\right)^2$ *denotes Uhlmann fidelity between states* $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\rm Fock}(\mathbb{C}^4)\right)$. *The following formula holds*

$$F_{\rm Gauss}(\rho) = \max_{\sigma\in\mathcal{M}_g^+} F(\rho,\sigma) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1 - C_+^2(\rho)}\,, \tag{4.33}$$

where $C_+(\rho)$ *is given by* (4.26).

Proof. The proof is given in the Section 8.2 of the Appendix (see page 162). □

Let us note that Fuchs-van de Graaf inequalities [132] can be used to bound the statistical (trace) distance [76] of any state ρ on $\mathcal{H}^+_{\rm Fock}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ to the set of convex-Gaussian states, $D(\rho, \mathcal{G}^c) = \min_{\sigma\in\mathcal{G}^c} \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mathrm{tr}\left((\rho-\sigma)^2\right)}$, by

$$1 - \sqrt{F_{\rm Gauss}(\rho)} \leq D(\rho, \mathcal{G}^{conv}) \leq \sqrt{1 - F_{\rm Gauss}(\rho)}\,. \tag{4.34}$$

Inequalities (4.34) together with (4.33) show that for a not convex-Gaussian state ρ, with support on $\mathcal{H}^+_{\rm Fock}(\mathbb{C}^4)$, the generalized concurrence $C_+(\rho)$ can be used do assess the resilience of the property of being not convex-Gaussian against noise.

4.2.3. Discussion

We have presented a complete analytical characterization (4.27) of convex-Gaussian states in the four-mode fermionic Fock space $\mathrm{Fock}(\mathbb{C}^4)$. Using methods taken from entanglement theory and theory of Lie groups we described quantitatively (c.f. (4.33)) how the property of being not convex-Gaussian is resilient to noise. These result have immediate consequence for the computation power of models in which FLO or TQC with Ising anyons are assisted with a noisy ancilla state. This follows form the fact that computations augmented with convex-Gaussian states are automatically classically simulable. We have used our methods to give a precise

value of the noise threshold $p_{cr} = \frac{8}{11}$ above which the state $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8|$ (used to make FLO or TQC computationally universal [22]), when depolarized, becomes convex-Gaussian. This result is especially interesting as the threshold value p_{cr} is much higher then previously known lower bounds. This opens a possibility for the existence of protocols based on FLO that would distill $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8|$ from a noisy state ρ and would be much more noise tolerant then the currently known ones. At the and we would like to mention that our method is limited to only to the case of $d = 4$ fermionic modes. From the proof of Theorem 4.3 if follows that it is impossible to extend the presented reasoning beyond $d = 4$ modes. A general method for detecting whether a state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{even}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ is not convex-Gaussian was given in [22]. Authors of [22] introduced a hierarchy of criteria based on the application of quantum de-Finetti theorem and a polynomial characterization of the set of pure fermionic Gaussian states. The hierarchy was proved to be exact (every not convex-Gaussian state is detected on some stage of the hierarchy). However, due to its high numerical complexity, the method was unfeasible in practice even for the case of four fermionic modes.

4.3. Summary and open problems

In this chapter we investigated cases in which coherent states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ of compact simply-connected Lie group K (irreducibly represented on in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$) admit a characterization in terms of the expectation value of the anti-unitary conjugation

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff |\langle\psi|\theta\psi\rangle| = 0\,. \tag{4.35}$$

This characterization enables, by the virtue of Uhlmann-Wotters construction (c.f. Subsection 4.1.1), to derive a closed-form analytic criterion characterizing the convex hull $\mathcal{M}^c \subset \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ of the set $\mathcal{M}$ (the convex hull $\mathcal{M}^c$ consists exclusively of non-correlated states if we chose $\mathcal{M}$ as the class of "non-correlated" pure states),

$$\rho \in \mathcal{M}^c \iff \lambda_1 \leq \sum_{k=2}^{N} \lambda_k\,, \tag{4.36}$$

where $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_N)$ is the non-increasingly ordered spectrum of the operator $\sqrt{\rho\theta\rho\theta}$. In Section **??** we classified, using methods of group theory and Riemannian geometry, all the cases when the class of coherent states can be described by the condition (4.35). The main results (which have been published in [93]) are contained in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. There, the characterization (4.35) is associated with particular properties of the group K and the decomposition of the representation $\text{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ onto irreducible components. In Section 4.2 we apply Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 to the problem of classical simulation of a computation model in which Fermionic Linear Optics is augmented with noisy ancilla state (which is a parameter of the model). If the auxiliary state ρ can be written as a convex combination of pure fermionic Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$, then the corresponding model of computation is classically simulable. Using tools developed in Section **??** and group-theoretical interpretation of $\mathcal{M}_g$ (c.f. Subsection 3.1.5) we gave a complete characterization of convex-Gaussian in the first nontrivial case of $d = 4$ modes (Theorem 4.3). As a byproduct of our considerations we solved an open problem recently given in 4.1 (see Example 4.1). We also introduced a generalized Schmidt decomposition for four mode pure fermionic states with fixed parity (see Lemma 4.1). This decomposition can be of importance for the distillation protocols which can promote ancilla-assisted FLO or ancilla-assisted TQC to the universal quantum computer.

Open problems

We now state open problems connected with the results presented in this chapter.

- Find the physical relevance of the "exceptional cases" (Spinor representation of Spin (7) and defining representation of G_2) in which coherent states are characterized by (4.35) (see Theorem 4.2)
- Develop improved protocols that would purify the state $|a_8\rangle\langle a_8|$ from a noisy mixed state from $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ and will be based on FLO or TQC. We expect that the analogy between entanglement and "non-Gaussianity" stated in (4.32) will contribute to this goal.
- Develop a full resource theory (analogous to the one existing in the context of entanglement [3] or ancilla-assisted Clifford computation[131]) for the ancilla-assisted FLO or TQC.

5. Polynomial criteria for detection of correlations for mixed states

This chapter deals with the problem of detection of correlations for mixed quantum states. In Chapter 3 we provided a polynomial characterization of various interesting classes of non-correlated pure quantum states. In the most general form our polynomial characterization is the following

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \mathrm{tr}\left(A\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right]\right) = 0\,, \tag{5.1}$$

where $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is the relevant class of pure states and $A : \mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})$ is a Hermitian operator characterizing (via (5.1)) the class $\mathcal{M}$. In accordance with the discussion presented in Chapter 1 we define the class of non-correlated states (with respect to the class $\mathcal{M}$) as a convex hull of $\mathcal{M}$, denoted by[1] $\mathcal{M}^c$,

$$\mathcal{M}^c = \left\{ \rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \;\middle|\; |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \in \mathcal{M},\, p_i \geq 0,\, \sum_i p_i = 1 \right\}. \tag{5.2}$$

In the previous chapter we characterized cases when the group-theoretical characterization of the set $\mathcal{M}$ allows for the complete analytical description of the set $\mathcal{M}^c$. In this Chapter we will investigate the following general problem.

Problem 5.1. (Detection problem) Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be a class of "non-correlated" pure states characterized via (5.1). Is it possible to derive, using the characterization (5.1), criteria for correlations for states $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$?

In this section we will partially solve the above problem by deriving a collection of correlation criteria that will take the general form:

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(V\left[\rho_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \rho_k\right]\right) > 0 \implies \rho_1 \notin \mathcal{M}^c\left(\rho_1 \text{is correlated}\right), \tag{5.3}$$

where $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_L \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ and $V : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k} \to \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$ is a Hermitian operator suitably tailored for the class $\mathcal{M}$. The structure of (5.3) resembles the standard criterion based on entanglement witnesses (see discussion in Section 2.2) and for this reason we will call operator V appearing in (5.3) *a multilinear correlation witness*[2].

The variety of criteria in which multilinear witnesses appear (for different number k and different classes $\mathcal{M}$) will be presented in the forthcoming sections. Before we concentrate on particular examples we first present a general discussion of criteria based on multilinear correlation

[1] In what follows we will assume that $\mathcal{H}$ is finite dimensional and ignore the necessity to work with topological closures (in, say, trace norm) of the purely algebraic convex hulls.

[2] We decided to use a different sign convention than the standard one used in the context of entanglement witnesses (see Section 2.2). This convention is a residue of the original motivation that led us to study criteria of the form (5.3). We arrived at criteria of this form by trying to find lower bounds for "generalized concurrences" (see Section 2.2). Consequantly the positive value of a function giving a lower bound was implying the correlations present in a given state.

witnesses. In what follows we will concentrate on multilinear witness that allow to infer about correlations of all states that appear in the criterion,

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(V\left[\rho_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \rho_k\right]\right) > 0 \implies \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k \notin \mathcal{M}^c \left(\rho_1,\ldots,\rho_k \text{ are correlated}\right). \tag{5.4}$$

Multilinear correlation witness satisfying (5.4) automatically satisfy (5.3) but not vice versa. Below we list advantages of studying multilinear witnesses.

- The general form of multilinear correlation witness (5.3) contains, as a specific example, the usual entanglement witnesses[3]. As it was pointed out in Section 2.2, the usual linear witnesses also suffice to characterize the set of non-correlated states $\mathcal{M}^c$. However, for arbitrary class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ (and the corresponding set of non-correlated states) we do not have a structural theory of the corresponding linear witnesses (see Section 2.2). For this reason construction of criteria based on multilinear correlation witnesses for a fairly general classes of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ (given by Eq. (5.1)) can be beneficial. We will use such a criterion in next chapter to derive an interesting quantitative characterization of typical correlation properties of general mixed states defined on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.
- Criteria (5.4) allow, in principle, to certify correlations in multiple mixed states $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k$ via the measurement of the expectation value of a single collective operator V.
- Multilinear witnesses allow to consider nontrivial criteria for detection of correlations that are invariant under the action of the relevant symmetry group. This would not have been possible if we had restricted ourselves only to criteria based on linear witnesses (see Section 5.3 for details). Invariance of the criterion under the action of the symmetry group means that for all states $\rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots, \rho_k \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$ we have

  $$\mathrm{tr}\left(V\left[\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes \rho_k\right]\right) = \mathrm{tr}\left(V\left[\rho'_1 \otimes \rho'_2 \ldots \otimes \rho'_k\right]\right), \tag{5.5}$$

  where $\rho'_i = U\rho_i U^\dagger$ and U is a unitary implementation of some element of the symmetry group (note that the same U acts on all parties $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$). Condition (5.5) is natural as in many cases considered (for instance in the entanglement problem) the class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ is invariant under the action of some symmetry group and, consequently, the corresponding notion of correlations is invariant under the action of this group (see Section 1.2 for a more thorough discussion of this matter).

The chapter is organized as follows. In Section 5.1 we present a construction of a bilinear correlation witness valid for all classes of states which can be characterized by the operator A acting on two copies of the relevant Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ (number k in Eq. (5.1) is two). In Section 5.2 we generalize this construction to the arbitrary natural number k. To be more precise we construct, starting from the condition (5.1), the operator V, acting on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$, that satisfy (5.4) for a given class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$. Section 5.3 contains the complete description of the structure of bilinear correlation witnesses that are invariant under the action of the relevant symmetry group in cases when the class $\mathcal{M}$ consists of group-theoretic coherent states and certain technical conditions are satisfied. In this section we use extensively representation theory of semisimple Lie algebras introduced in Subsection 2.4.3. This methodology allows us to analyze analytically the strength of criteria for classes of states presented in Section 3.1: product states, product bosonic states, Slater determinants and fermionic Gaussian states. We conclude the chapter in Section 5.4 where we summarize the obtained results and state some open problems.

Throughout this chapter we will consequently use the notation introduced in Chapter 3. The announced criteria for detection of various correlations will be tested in practice on particular examples and in some cases confronted with the existing literature of the subject (see in

[3] It is enough to put $V = -W \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}$, where W is the usual entanglement witness.

particular Section 5.3). The main technical advantage of the criteria of the form (5.4) is that they can be easily used to study typical correlation properties of states belonging to the set of density matrices $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ and on its submanifolds. The forthcoming Chapter 6 is devoted to study of this problem. The list of criteria of particular type for detection of different kinds of correlations in mixed states are given in Table 5.1

Type of correlations	Bilinear witness	Multilinear witness	Optimal bilinear witness
Entanglement	Yes	Yes	Yes
Entanglement of bosons	Yes	Yes	Yes
"Entanglement" of fermions	Yes	Yes	Yes
Not convex-Gaussian	Yes	Yes	Yes
GME	No	Yes	No
Schmidt rank $\geq m$	No	Yes	No

Table 5.1. Criteria detecting correlations in mixed states presented in this chapter. Each row of the table correspond to a different kind of correlation studied (the class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ giving rise to a particular type of correlations is implicit). The last tree columns specify whether the correlation witness of particular type is provided for the particular kind of correlations.

Results presented in Section 5.1 constitute parts of [114]. Results presented in Section 5.2 will contribute to the forthcoming paper

> *"Multilinear criteria for detection of generalized entanglement"*, Michał Oszmaniec, et al. (in preparation),

whereas results contained in Section 5.3 will constitute a major part of another forthcoming publication

> *"Criteria for quantum correlations based on second moments of the density matrices"*, Michał Oszmaniec, et al. (in preparation).

5.1. Bilinear correlation witnesses based on quadratic characterization of pure non-correlated states

In this section we derive a bilinear correlation witness for correlations defined via the choice of the class of pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ specified by the quadratic (in the state's density matrix) condition

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \langle\psi|\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,, \tag{5.6}$$

where, just like in Section 3.3, A is a Hermitian operator acting on $\mathrm{Sym}^2\mathcal{H}$ that satisfies $A \leq \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}$, where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}$ denotes the orthonormal projection onto $\mathrm{Sym}^2\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}$. Our criterion for detection of correlations in the mixed states takes a particularly simple form.

Theorem 5.1. *Let the class of pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be specified by Eq.* (5.6)*. Then, the following implication holds*

$$\mathrm{tr}\,(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2\, V) > 0 \implies \rho_1 \text{ and } \rho_2 \text{ are correlated } (\rho_1, \rho_2 \notin \mathcal{M}^c)\,, \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$V = A - \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}} \tag{5.8}$$

and $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto the two fold antisymmetrization, $\bigwedge^2\mathcal{H}$, of $\mathcal{H}$.

We would like to note that the above criterion is independent upon the dimension of $\mathcal{H}$ and uses only the algebraic structure of the set $\mathcal{M}$. The proof of Theorem 5.1 follows from Lemmas 5.1, 5.2 which we present below.

Lemma 5.1. Consider a class of pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$. *Assume that there exists an operator* $V \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ *satisfying the property* $\langle v|\langle w|V|v\rangle|w\rangle \leq 0$ *for all* $|v\rangle\langle v| \in \mathcal{M}$ *and for arbitrary* $|w\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. *Then, for any state* $\rho \in \mathcal{M}^C$ *and for arbitrary* $B \geq 0$ *acting on* $\mathcal{H}$, *we have*

$$\mathrm{tr}\left([\rho \otimes B]\, V\right) \leq 0\,. \tag{5.9}$$

Moreover, if we assume $\mathbb{S}V\mathbb{S} = V$, *for* $\mathbb{S}$ *being a swap operator*[4] *in* $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$, *then except for 5.9 we have*

$$\mathrm{tr}\left([B \otimes \rho]\, V\right) \leq 0\,. \tag{5.10}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1 . Since the expression (5.9) is linear in B and every non-negative operator is of the form $B = \sum_i |w_i\rangle\langle w_i|$ for some (not necessary normalized) $|w_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, it is enough to consider $B = |w\rangle\langle w|$, where $|w\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ is arbitrary. By definition the condition $\rho \in \mathcal{M}^c$ is equivalent to $\rho = \sum_j p_j |v_j\rangle\langle v_j|$ for $|v_i\rangle\langle v_i| \in \mathcal{M}$ and $p_j \geq 0$, $\sum_j p_j = 1$. Using that and the assumption (5.9) about the operator V we get

$$\mathrm{tr}\left([\rho \otimes |w\rangle\langle w|]\, V\right) = \sum_j p_j \langle v_j|\langle w|V|w\rangle|v_j\rangle \leq 0\,.$$

This concludes the proof of (5.9). Inequality (5.10) follows immediately from the definition of $\mathbb{S}$ and inequality (5.9). □

The permutation invariant operator V (assuming that it exists) from Lemma 5.1 gives a criterion of the type (5.7). Indeed, whenever we find a non-negative operator B for which $\mathrm{tr}\left((\rho_1 \otimes B)\, V\right) > 0$ we know that $\rho_1 \notin \mathcal{M}^C$. Note that without the loss of generality we can take $B = \rho_2$. Now, using the permutation symmetry of V and (5.10) we can exchange roles of ρ_1 and ρ_2 which proves that

$$\mathrm{tr}\left([\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2]\, V\right) > 0 \implies \text{both } \rho_1 \text{ and } \rho_2 \text{ are correlated } \left(\rho_1, \rho_2 \notin \mathcal{M}^C\right).$$

We remark that the condition $\langle v|\langle w|V|v\rangle|w\rangle \leq 0$ ($|v\rangle\langle v| \in \mathcal{M}$ and $|w\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$) from Lemma 5.1 is relatively easy check as it only only involves computing expectation values on pure states. This observation will be useful in proofs of Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 5.3.

Lemma 5.1 does not say anything about the existence of the operator V for a given class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$. The following theorem ensures that as the operator one can take $V = A - \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ wherever $\mathcal{M}$ is given by the condition (5.6).

Lemma 5.2. *Consider the class of pure states* $\mathcal{M}$ *given by* (5.6). *The operator* $V = A - \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ *satisfies* $\langle v|\langle w|V|v\rangle|w\rangle \leq 0$ for all $|v\rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ and for arbitrary $|w\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2 . Let $|v\rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ and let $|w\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. Let us write $|w\rangle = |v_{||}\rangle + |v_\perp\rangle$, where $|v_{||}\rangle \propto |v\rangle$ and $|v_\perp\rangle \perp |v\rangle$. We have the following equalities

$$\langle v|\langle w|A|v\rangle|w\rangle = \langle v|\langle v_\perp|A|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle\,,$$

$$\langle v|\langle w|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}|v\rangle|w\rangle = \langle v|\langle v_\perp|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle\,.$$

[4] A swap operator is defined by its action on simple tensors $\mathbb{S}|\psi\rangle|\phi\rangle = |\phi\rangle|\psi\rangle$for $|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$.

We have used the fact that operator A is an orthonormal projector and therefore we have $A|v\rangle|v\rangle = A|v\rangle|v_{||}\rangle = 0$. Consequently, we get the desired inequality

$$\langle v|\langle w|V|v\rangle|w\rangle = \langle v|\langle v_\perp|A|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle \leq 0\,, \tag{5.11}$$

where the estimate stems from the fact that $\langle v|\langle v_\perp|A|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle \leq \langle v|\langle v_\perp|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle$, where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}$ is the projector onto $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H})$. □

Analysis of proof of Lemma 5.2 leads to a simple extensions of Theorem 5.1 given by the following corollary

Corollary 5.1. *Operator V appearing in Theorem 5.1 can be taken to be*

$$V = A - c\cdot\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}\,, \tag{5.12}$$

where the constant c is given by

$$c = 2\cdot\left(\max_{|v\rangle\langle v|\in\mathcal{M}}\max_{|v_\perp\rangle\neq 0}\frac{\langle v|\langle v_\perp|A|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle}{\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle}\right), \tag{5.13}$$

and $|v_\perp\rangle$ denotes the arbitrary vector in $\mathcal{H}$ perpendicular to $|v\rangle$. The constant c given by the above equation is the smallest possible number β such that operator $A - \beta\cdot\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 5.1.

Proof. Follows directly from Eq.(5.11). □

Corollary 5.2. *The above derived criteria for detection of correlations defined by the choice of the class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ are also valid if the operator A and the class $\mathcal{M}$ are related in the following manner*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \implies \langle\psi|\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0\,, \tag{5.14}$$

where operator A satisfy $0 \leq A \leq \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}$.

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 5.1 and from the straightforward modification of the proof of Lemma 5.2 based on the inequality

$$\langle v|\langle w|A|v\rangle|w\rangle \leq \langle v|\langle v_\perp|A|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle\,.$$

□

Before moving to the concrete examples let us note that due to the characterization (5.6) the criterion based on $V = A - c\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ is exact for pure states in the following sense

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes 2}\right]\,V\right) = 0\,. \tag{5.15}$$

We will now derive the optimal constants c (in a sense of Corollary 5.1) for four types of correlations defined via classes of coherent states discussed in Section 3.1: product states, product bosonic states, Slater determinants and pure fermionic Gaussian states. We will also apply the obtained criteria to witness correlations for some exemplary families of states.

5.1.1. Entanglement of distinguishable particles

We now apply Corollary 5.1 to the case when $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_d \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_d)$ consists of pure product states of L distinguishable particles. In the following proposition we use the notation introduced in Subsection 3.1.1.

Proposition 5.1. *Let*

$$A = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{+}_{11'} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{+}_{22'} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{P}^{+}_{LL'}$$

and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_d$. The constant c appearing in Corollary 5.1 equals

$$c = 1 - 2^{1-L}\,. \tag{5.16}$$

Consequently, the operator

$$V_d = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{+}_{11'} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{+}_{22'} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{P}^{+}_{LL'} - \left(1 - 2^{1-L}\right) \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}} \tag{5.17}$$

is the largest operator having a structure $A - \beta\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ that satisfies assumptions of Lemma 5.1 and can be used to detect entanglement.

Proof. The proof of Eq.(5.16) is simple yet technical. The detailed proof is given in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 163). □

The criterion based on the operator (5.17) is identical to the criterion based on the lower bound of the L-partite concurrence (see Subsection 2.2) obtained in a paper by Aolita and Mintert [67]. Our analysis shows that no stronger criterion based on the operator of the structure $A - \beta\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ is possible. The general analysis of all LU-invariant bilinear entanglement witnesses will be given in Subsection 5.3.2.

5.1.2. Entanglement of bosons

We apply Corollary 5.1 to the case when $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_b \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_b)$ consists of pure product states of a system consisting of L bosons. In the following proposition we use the notation introduced in Subsection 3.1.2.

Proposition 5.2. *Let*

$$A = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{+}_{11'} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{+}_{22'} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{P}^{+}_{LL'} \left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right)$$

and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_b$. The constant c appearing in Corollary 5.1 for the equals

$$c = 1 - 2^{1-L}\,. \tag{5.18}$$

Consequently, the operator

$$V_b = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{+}_{11'} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{+}_{22'} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{P}^{+}_{LL'} \left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right) - \left(1 - 2^{1-L}\right) \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}} \tag{5.19}$$

is the largest operator having a structure $A - \beta\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ that satisfies assumptions of Lemma 5.1 and can be used to detect entanglement.

Proof. The proof is completely analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.1 and follows from the fact that

$$V_b = \left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right) V_d \left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right)$$

in the case when all single-particle Hilbert spaces in the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_d = \otimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{H}_i$ are identical. □

5.1.3. "Entanglement" of fermions

We will now apply Corollary 5.1 to the case when $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_f \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H}_f)$ consists of projectors onto Slater determinants in the system of L fermions. Recall that the correlations induced by such choice of the class $\mathcal{M}$ are correlations in states that do not follow merely form the antisymmetrizations of wave functions in $\mathcal{H}_f$ (c.f. Section 1.1). In what follows we will use the notation introduced in Subsection 3.1.3.

Proposition 5.3. *Let*

$$A = A_f = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \frac{2^L}{L+1}\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \otimes \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'} \left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right)$$

and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_f$. The constant c appearing in Proposition 5.1 equals

$$c = 1 - \frac{2}{L+1-\max\{0, 2L-d\}}. \tag{5.20}$$

Consequently, the operator

$$V_f = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \frac{2^L}{L+1}\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \otimes \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'} \left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right) - c\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}} \tag{5.21}$$

is the largest operator having a structure $A_f - \beta\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ that satisfies assumptions of Lemma 5.1 and can be used to detect whether a given state ρ is correlated ($\rho \notin \mathcal{M}_f^c$).

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.1 and is given in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 163). Let us explain here the reason for the occurrence of the number $\max\{0, 2L-d\}$ in (5.20). Let $|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_f$ be two Slater determinants constructed from single-particle orbitals $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^d$, forming a basis of a single particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \approx \mathbb{C}^d$. The number $\max\{0, 2L-d\}$ is the minimal number of times that the same orbitals can occur in both $|\psi_0\rangle$and $|\psi_1\rangle$. □

Example 5.1. We now apply the criterion stated above to study correlations of a depolarization of an arbitrary pure state of two fermions. Since the problem for $d = 4$ can be solved exactly (see Section (**??**)) we consider situation when $d > 4$. Any normalized vector $|\psi\rangle \in \bigwedge^2(\mathbb{C}^d)$ can be written [21] as

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{i=\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor} \lambda_i |\phi_{2i-1}\rangle \wedge |\phi_{2i}\rangle, \tag{5.22}$$

where $\lambda_i \geq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^{i=\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor} \lambda_i^2 = 1$ and vectors $|\phi_i\rangle (i = 1, \ldots, d)$ form the orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^d$. The arbitrary depolarization of state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is given by

$$\rho_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}(p) = (1-p)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + p\frac{2\mathbb{I}}{d(d-1)}, \tag{5.23}$$

Direct usage of the criterion (5.7) based on the operator (5.21) for $\rho_1 = \rho_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}(p)$ and $\rho_2 = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ gives that $\rho_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}(p)$ is correlated for

$$p < p_{cr} = \frac{\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{i=\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor} \lambda_i^4\right)}{\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{i=\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor} \lambda_i^4\right) + f(d)}, \tag{5.24}$$

where $f(d) = 4\frac{d-2}{d(d-1)}$. The proof of (5.24) follows from identities:

$$\langle\psi|\langle\psi|A_f|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{3}\left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{i=\lfloor\frac{d}{2}\rfloor} \lambda_i^4\right),$$

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\mathbb{I}\otimes|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right]A_f\right) = \frac{(d-2)(d-3)}{6\cdot 2},$$

which are the consequence of Eq.(8.28).

5.1.4. Not convex-Gaussian correlation

In the situation of the class of pure fermionic Gaussian states (see Subsection 3.1.5) we have two situations to consider. We can either take $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ or impose parity superselection rule and take $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_g^+ \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ (the treatment of $\mathcal{M}_g^- \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^-\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$) is analogous). In the discussion that follows we will use the notation introduced in Subsection 3.1.5.

No parity superselection rule Recall that in the case $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ we have

$$A = A_g = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}_0,$$

where operator $\mathbb{P}_0 : \mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right) \to \mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ is given by Eq.(3.52)). Application of Corollary 5.1 to the case when $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_g \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathrm{Fock}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ gives $c = 1$. This follows from the fact that the operator has a support solely on the subspace

$$\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\otimes\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)\oplus\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^-\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\otimes\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^-\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right),$$

of the total tensor product $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\otimes\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ and $\langle 0|\langle\psi|\mathbb{P}_0|0\rangle|\psi\rangle = 0$ for $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^-\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$.

Parity superselection rule imposed In the case $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_g^+ \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ we get a nontrivial value of the constant c, as described by the following proposition.

The general discussion of bilinear non-Gaussianity witnesses invariant under the action of Bogolyubov transformations will be given in Subsection 5.3.5.

Proposition 5.4. *Let* $A : \mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right) \to \mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ *be given by*

$$A = A_g = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}_+\mathbb{P}_0\mathbb{P}_+, \tag{5.25}$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}_+ = \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{I}+Q)\otimes(\mathbb{I}+Q).$$

Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_g^+ \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$. *Assume that* $d \leq 1000$. *The constant* c *appearing in Corollary 5.1 equals*

$$c_d = 1 - a_d, \tag{5.26}$$

where

$$a_d = \frac{1}{2^{2d}}\binom{2d}{d}\sum_{k=0}^{d}\sum_{m=0}^{\min\left\{k,2\lfloor\frac{d}{2}\rfloor\right\}}(-2)^m\frac{\binom{d}{k}}{\binom{2d}{2k}}\binom{d-m}{k-m}\binom{\lfloor\frac{d}{2}\rfloor}{m}.$$

Consequently, the operator

$$V_g = \mathbb{P}^{\text{sym}} - \mathbb{P}_+\mathbb{P}_0\mathbb{P}_+ - c_d\mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}} \tag{5.27}$$

is the largest operator having a structure $A - \beta\mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}$ *that satisfies assumptions of Lemma 5.1 and can be used, via Lemma to detect whether a given state* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ *is not convex-Gaussian* ($\rho \notin \left(\mathcal{M}^+_g\right)^c$).

Proof. The reasoning is completely analogous to that from the proof of Proposition 5.1. The sketch of the proof is given in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 164). □

Remark 5.1. The limitation of the number of fermionic modes $d \leq 1000$ in Proposition 5.4 stems solely from the combinatorial complexity of the formulas involved in the proof of 5.4. We proved Eq.(5.26) by a direct computation with Mathematica up to $d = 1000$. We conjecture that (5.26) holds for arbitrary positive integer d.

5.2. Multilinear correlation witness

In this section we derive a k-linear correlation witness for correlations defined via the choice of the class of pure "non-correlated" states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ specified by the k-linear (in the state's density matrix) condition

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \langle\psi^{\otimes k}|A|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle = 0\ , \tag{5.28}$$

where A is the Hermitian operator acting on $\text{Sym}^k\mathcal{H}$ (k-fold symmetric power of $\mathcal{H}$) satisfying $A \leq \mathbb{P}^{\text{sym},k}$ (operator $\mathbb{P}^{\text{sym,k}}$ is the orthogonal projector onto $\text{Sym}^k\mathcal{H}$). For exemplary types of correlations that can be defined by such a choice of "non-correlated" pure states see Section 3.3. After presenting the main result, the k-linear generalization of theorem 5.1, we will apply the obtained criteria to detect genuine multiparty entanglement (see Subsection 3.3.1) and Schmidt rank (see Subsection 3.3.2) for exemplary families of mixed states.

Theorem 5.2. *Consider the class of "non-correlated" pure states* $\mathcal{M}$ *specified by*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \langle\psi^{\otimes k}|A|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle = 0\ . \tag{5.29}$$

Let

$$V = A - (k-1)\left(\mathbb{I}^{\otimes k} - \mathbb{P}^{\text{sym,k}}\right)\ . \tag{5.30}$$

The following implication holds

$$\text{tr}\left([\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes \rho_k]\, V\right) > 0 \implies \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k \notin \mathcal{M}^c\ (\rho_1,\ldots,\rho_k \text{ are correlated})\,. \tag{5.31}$$

Proof. The straightforward generalization of Lemma 5.1 shows that for the operator $V \in \text{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes\text{k}}\right)$, which is permutation-symmetric[5], and arbitrary class of pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$, the implication (5.31) is equivalent to the following condition

$$\langle\psi|\langle\phi_1|\ldots\langle\phi_{k-1}|V|\psi\rangle|\phi_1\rangle\ldots|\phi_{k-1}\rangle \leq 0\ , \tag{5.32}$$

where $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ and $|\phi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ $(i = 1,\ldots k-1)$ are arbitrary vectors. In what follows we will check that the operator

$$V = A - (k-1)\left(\mathbb{I}^{\otimes k} - \mathbb{P}^{\text{sym,k}}\right) \tag{5.33}$$

[5] The operator $V \in \text{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes\text{k}}\right)$ is permutation invariant if and only if it satisfies $\sigma V\sigma^\dagger = V$, where σ is an arbitrary permutation operator flipping factors of the tensor product $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$ (See Section 2.4.3 for the description of the action of the permutation group S_k on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$).

satisfies (5.32). We proceed analogously to the case of the proof of Lemma (5.2). Let us fix $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{M}$ and $|\phi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ $(i = 1, \dots k-1)$ appearing (5.32). For each $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ we have a decomposition

$$|\phi_i\rangle = |\phi_i^{||}\rangle + |\phi_i^{\perp}\rangle\,, \tag{5.34}$$

where $|\phi_i^{||}\rangle \propto |\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi_i^{\perp}\rangle \perp |\psi\rangle$. Note that the vectors appearing in (5.34) are in general not normalized. We introduce the following notation

$$|\Phi^X\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{k-1} |\phi_i^{X(i)}\rangle\,, \tag{5.35}$$

where $X \subset \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ and

$$|\phi_i^{X(i)}\rangle = \begin{cases} |\phi_i^{||}\rangle & \text{for } i \in X\,, \\ |\phi_i^{\perp}\rangle & \text{for } i \notin X\,. \end{cases}$$

Using (5.34) we get

$$\langle\psi|\langle\phi_1|\dots\langle\phi_{k-1}|A|\psi\rangle|\phi_1\rangle\dots|\phi_{k-1}\rangle = \sum_{X,Y\subset\{1,\dots,k-1\}} \langle\psi|\langle\Phi^X|A|\psi\rangle|\Phi^Y\rangle\,.$$

Using definitions of the class $\mathcal{M}$ (see Eq.(5.29)) and vectors $|\phi^X\rangle$ we get

$$\langle\psi|\langle\phi_1|\dots\langle\phi_{k-1}|A|\psi\rangle|\phi_1\rangle\dots|\phi_{k-1}\rangle = \sum_{l,m=0}^{k-2} \langle\psi|\langle\Phi^l|A|\psi\rangle|\Phi^m\rangle\,, \tag{5.36}$$

where

$$|\Phi^l\rangle = \sum_{\substack{X\subset\{1,\dots,k-1\}\\ |X|=l}} |\Phi^X\rangle\,.$$

We have the following chain of estimates

$$\sum_{l,m=0}^{k-2} \langle\psi|\langle\Phi^l|A|\psi\rangle|\Phi^m\rangle \le \sum_{l,m=0}^{k-2} \langle\psi|\langle\Phi^l|\mathbb{P}^{k,\mathrm{sym}}|\psi\rangle|\Phi^m\rangle\,, \tag{5.37}$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \langle\psi|\langle\Phi^l|\mathbb{P}^{k,\mathrm{sym}}|\psi\rangle|\Phi^l\rangle \tag{5.38}$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \frac{l+1}{k} \langle\psi|\langle\Phi^l|\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{P}^{k-1,\mathrm{sym}}|\psi\rangle|\Phi^l\rangle\,. \tag{5.39}$$

$$\le \frac{k-1}{k} \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \langle\psi|\psi\rangle\langle\Phi^l|\Phi^l\rangle \tag{5.40}$$

The equality (5.38) follows from the fact that $\mathbb{P}^{k,\mathrm{sym}}|\psi\rangle|\Phi^m\rangle \perp |\psi\rangle|\Phi^l\rangle$ for $l \neq m$. The equality (5.39) follows from the fact that $\langle\psi|\phi_i^{X(i)}\rangle = 0$ for $i \notin X$. Combining (5.40) with (5.36) we get

$$\langle\psi|\langle\phi_1|\dots\langle\phi_{k-1}|A|\psi\rangle|\phi_1\rangle\dots|\phi_{k-1}\rangle \le \frac{k-1}{k} \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \langle\psi|\psi\rangle\langle\Phi^l|\Phi^l\rangle. \tag{5.41}$$

On the other hand we have

$$\langle\psi|\langle\phi_1|\ldots\langle\phi_{k-1}|\left(\mathbb{I}^{\otimes k}-\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,k}}\right)|\phi_1\rangle\ldots|\phi_{k-1}\rangle=\sum_{l=0}^{k-2}\langle\psi|\langle\Phi^l|\left(\mathbb{I}^{\otimes k}-\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,k}}\right)|\psi\rangle|\Phi^l\rangle\,.$$

Using the analogous estimates to (5.40) for $\langle\psi|\langle\Phi^l|\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,k}}|\psi\rangle|\Phi^l\rangle$ shows that the operator V, defined by (5.33), satisfies (5.32). □

Before moving to the examples of application of the criterion (5.31) let us note that due to the characterization (5.28) the criterion (5.31) is exact for pure states in the following sense

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\in\mathcal{M}\iff\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right]\,V\right)=0\,. \tag{5.42}$$

5.2.1. Witnessing Genuine Multiparty Entanglement

Let us now use Theorem 5.1 to witness genuine multiparty entanglement in tripartite system. In this scenario the set of non-correlated pure states consists of pure 2-separable states[6] $\mathcal{M}_d^2\subset\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ (see Subsection 3.3.1).

Definition 5.1. A tripartite mixed state $\rho\in\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ exhibit genuine multiparty entanglement if and only of $\rho\notin(\mathcal{M}_d^2)^c$.

We now apply the criterion (5.31) and the polynomial characterization of $\mathcal{M}_d^2$ (given in Lemma 3.7) to obtain a criterion for genuine multiparty entanglement.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $\rho\in\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d\otimes\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. Let*

$$V=A-5\left(\mathbb{I}^{\otimes 6}-\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,6}}\right)\,, \tag{5.43}$$

where[7]

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,6}}\circ\left(A^{1:23}\otimes A^{2:13}\otimes A^{3:12}\right)\circ\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,6}}\,, \tag{5.44}$$

The following implication holds

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\rho_1\otimes\rho_2\otimes\ldots\otimes\rho_6\right]V\right)>0\implies\rho_1,\ldots,\rho_6\text{ are genuinly multiparty entangled.} \tag{5.45}$$

5.2.2. Witnessing states with Schmidt number greater than n

We now apply Theorem 5.1 to witness correlations based on the notion of Schmidt rank of bipartite state. Recall (see Subsection 3.3.2) that the class $\mathcal{M}_n\subset\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}_B\right)$ was defined as the set consisting of pure states with Schmidt rank at most n ($n\leq\min\left\{\dim\left(\mathcal{H}_A\right),\dim\left(\mathcal{H}_B\right)\right\}$). Let us first define, after [29], the notion of the Schmidt number of a bipartite states.

Definition 5.2. A bipartite density matrix $\rho\in\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}_B\right)$ has Schmidt number k ($\mathrm{Sr}\left(\rho\right)=k$) if and only if $\rho\in\mathcal{M}_n^c$ and $\rho\notin\mathcal{M}_{n-1}^c$.

Straightforward application of criterion (5.31) and Lemma 3.8 allow us to witness states with Schmidt number greater than n.

[6] For simplicity we assume that dimensions of single particle Hilbert spaces are identical.

[7] For the explanation of the notation used in Eq.(5.44) see Subsection 3.3.1.

Corollary 5.4. *Let* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B\right)$. *Let*

$$V_n = A_n - (n)\left(\mathbb{I}^{\otimes n+1} - \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,n+1}}\right), \tag{5.46}$$

where[8]

$$A_n = \mathbb{P}_A^{\mathrm{asym},n+1} \otimes \mathbb{P}_B^{\mathrm{asym},n+1}, \tag{5.47}$$

The following implication holds

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes \rho_{n+1}\right] V_n\right) > 0 \implies \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_{n+1} \textit{ have Schmidt number higher than } n\,. \tag{5.48}$$

Example 5.2. We now apply the criterion stated above to study Schmidt number $\rho(p) \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ of a depolarized maximally entangled state of two qdits,

$$\rho(p) = (1-p)\,|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| + p\frac{\mathbb{I}}{d^2},$$

where $|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{i=1}^{d}|i\rangle|i\rangle$ ($\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=d}$ is a standard orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^d$). The usage of criterion (5.48) for $\rho_1 = \rho(p)$ and $\rho_i = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ for $i > 1$ gives the following information about Schmidt number of the state $\rho(p)$.

$$p < p_{cr,n} = \frac{\mathcal{A}_n}{(n\cdot(1-\mathcal{C}_n) - \mathcal{A}_n - \mathcal{B}_n -)} \implies \rho(p) \text{ has Schmidt number greater than } n\,, \tag{5.49}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes n+1}\right] A_n\right) = \frac{\binom{d}{n+1}}{[(n+1)!]\,d^{n+1}}, \tag{5.50}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_n = \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\frac{1}{d^2}\mathbb{I}\otimes\left\{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes n}\right\}\right] A_n\right) = \frac{d-n}{d^{n-1}}\binom{d-1}{n}, \tag{5.51}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\frac{1}{d^2}\mathbb{I}\otimes\left\{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes n}\right\}\right]\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,n+1}}\right)\frac{1}{d^2}\left(1+\frac{d^2-1}{n+1}\right). \tag{5.52}$$

The only difficult part is proof of (5.51) (Eq.(5.50) follows directly from from Eq.(3.90) whereas the proof of Eq.(5.52) is straightforward). This formula can be proven by performing the computation analogous to the one given in the proof of Proposition 3.6 (see page 160).

5.3. Optimal group-invariant bilinear correlation witness

Problem 5.2. What is the structure of the bilinear, group invariant, criteria in cases when the class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ consists of generalized coherent sates of a compact simply-connected Lie group?

Before we formulate the answer to the above question in a rigorous manner we recall the notation used in Section 3.1 and define formally the concept of "bilinear, group invariant, correlation criteria". Let K be a compact simply-connected Lie group irreducibly represented, by the representation Π on the finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ (see Sections 2.4 and 3.1 for the

[8] For the explanation of the notation used in Eq.(5.47) see Subsection 3.3.2.

explanation of the terminology used in this section). Let the class of states considered consists of Perelomov's coherent states, i.e.

$$\mathcal{M} = \left\{ \Pi(k) |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| \Pi(k)^\dagger \mid k \in K \right\} , \tag{5.53}$$

where $|\psi_0\rangle$ is the highest weight vector corresponding to the highest weight λ_0. In what follows we will consequently drop the superscript λ_0 when referring to the carrier space of the representation Π. Let us define the concept of K-invariant bilinear correlation witness.

Definition 5.3. An operator $V \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ is called K-invariant bilinear correlation witness if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied

1. For all $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ we have

$$\mathrm{tr}([\rho \otimes \sigma] V) > 0 \implies \text{both } \rho \text{ and } \sigma \text{ are correlated } (\rho, \sigma \notin \mathcal{M}^c) . \tag{5.54}$$

2. Operator V is K-invariant, i.e. for all $k \in K$

$$V = (\Pi(k) \otimes \Pi(k)) V \left(\Pi(k)^\dagger \otimes \Pi(k)^\dagger \right) . \tag{5.55}$$

The set of K-invariant bilinear correlation witnesses will be denoted by $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$.

Let us note that condition (5.55) is equivalent to the K-invariance of the criterion specified by V, i.e. the requirement that for all $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ and for all $k \in K$

$$\mathrm{tr}([\rho \otimes \sigma] V) = \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\rho} \otimes \tilde{\sigma} V) , \tag{5.56}$$

where $\tilde{X} = \Pi(k) X \Pi(k)^\dagger$. The equivalence of (5.55) and (5.56) follows from the fact that trace is a unitary invariant function and the existence of the Haar measure on K. By the trace invariance we mean $\mathrm{tr}(A) = \mathrm{tr}\left(UAU^\dagger\right)$ for all unitary U. The existence of the Haar measure μ on K shows that the operator V in (5.56) can be replaced by

$$V' = \int_K d\mu(k) (\Pi(k) \otimes \Pi(k)) V (\Pi(k) \otimes \Pi(k))^\dagger ,$$

which is a manifestly K-invariant operator and gives, by the virtue of (5.56), the same criterion as V.

Let us also remark that a mapping $k \to \Pi(k) \otimes \Pi(k)$ can be interpreted as a standard tensor product of representation Π with itself (see Eq. (2.49)). Consequently, the condition (5.56) can be interpreted as the invariance of the criterion (5.54), when a sate ρ, σ undergo the same unitary evolution described by $\Pi(k)$, $k \in K$ (see Figure 5.1 for the illustration of this idea). This is a natural requirement as, by definition, the notion of correlations is invariant under the action of the group K.

The rest of the section is organized as follows. First in Subsection 5.3.1 we describe in detail the structure of the set $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ and the strength of correlation criteria based on $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$. After the general discussion valid for all compact simply-connected Lie groups we will focus on four specific types of correlations that bear a physical relevance:

- Entanglement in system of distinguishable particles; $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_d$ - pure product states (Subsection 5.3.2);
- Entanglement in system of finite number of bosons; $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_b$ - symmetric product states (Subsection 5.3.3);



Figure 5.1. To states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ undergo a simultaneous evolution according to the unitary transformation $\Pi(k)$ which represents the same element of the symmetry group $k \in K$. Mathematically this transformation is described by the mapping $\rho \otimes \sigma \to \tilde{\rho} \otimes \tilde{\sigma}$, where $\tilde{X} = \Pi(k) X \Pi(k)^{\dagger}$.

- "Entanglement" in system of finite number of fermions; $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_f$ - symmetric product states (Subsection 5.3.4);
- Not convex-Gaussian correlation in fermionic systems; $\mathcal{M}_g$ - Fermionic Gaussian states (Subsection 5.3.5).

In each of above cases we will give explicitly the structure $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ and discuss the strength of the corresponding criteria. We conclude the section with the discussion of the obtained results presented in Subsection 5.3.6.

5.3.1. Structure of $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$

We start with the description of the basic properties of the set $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$.

Lemma 5.3. *The set $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ is a finite dimensional convex cone*[9] *in* $\mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$.

Proof. Condition (5.54), which essentially describes the property of being a correlation witness, is equivalent to

$$\mathrm{tr}([\rho \otimes \sigma]\, V) \leq 0 \impliedby \rho \text{ or } \sigma \text{ are not-correlated } \ (\rho \text{ or } \sigma \in \mathcal{M}^c)\ . \tag{5.57}$$

The above implication is certainly satisfied for $V' = V_1 + V_2$ if it is satisfied for both V_1 and V_2. The same concerns dilation by a non-negative scalar. Moreover, the property of being K-invariant (See Eq. (5.55)) is intact if we take sum of operators or multiply it by a positive number. Therefore, $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ is a convex cone in $\mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$. A set $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ is finite-dimensional because $\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional (by definition) and therefore dimension of $\mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ if finite. □

Let us recall that the commutant (see Subsection 2.4.3 for a more detailed discussion of this concept) of the representation $\Pi \otimes \Pi$ of K in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$, denoted by $\mathrm{Comm}(\mathbb{C}[\Pi \otimes \Pi(K)])$, is

[9] A convex cone $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{V}$ in a finite dimensional real vector space $\mathcal{V}$ is a set satisfying: (i) $c_1 + c_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ for $c_{1,2} \in \mathcal{C}$, and (ii) $\alpha \cdot c \in \mathcal{C}$ for a scalar $\alpha \geq 0$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

a subalgebra of $\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H})$ consisting of operators that commute with the representation of $\Pi\otimes\Pi$ of the group K,

$$X\in\mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathbb{C}\,[\Pi\otimes\Pi\,(K)])\iff[X,\,\Pi\,(k)\otimes\Pi\,(k)]=0\,, \tag{5.58}$$

for all $k\in K$. We observe that

$$\mathcal{W}_2^K\,(\mathcal{M})\subset\mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathbb{C}\,[\Pi\otimes\Pi\,(K)])\cap\mathrm{Herm}\,(\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H})\ . \tag{5.59}$$

In many cases the structure of the commutant is known or can be easily deduced. This will prove to be useful and will allow to describe $\mathcal{W}_2^K\,(\mathcal{M})$ explicitly in examples that follow.

The following theorem states that under certain technical condition on the representation Π the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^K\,(\mathcal{M})$ is the intersection of finite number of half-spaces.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\Pi:K\to\mathrm{U}\,(\mathcal{H})$ be an irreducible representation of the group K with the property that all weight spaces are one-dimensional*[10]*. Let $\mathrm{Comm}\,(\Pi\otimes\Pi\,(K))$ posses the following property*

$$X\in\mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathbb{C}\,[\Pi\otimes\Pi\,(K)])\Longrightarrow\mathbb{S}X\mathbb{S}=X\,, \tag{5.60}$$

for $\mathbb{S}$ being a swap operator in $\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}$. Under this condition the cone of K-invariant correlation witnesses $\mathcal{W}_2^K\,(\mathcal{M})$ is the intersection of finite number of half-spaces given by the following inequalities[11]

$$\langle\psi_0|\langle\psi_\lambda|V|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_\lambda\rangle\leq 0\,, \tag{5.61}$$

where $V\in\mathrm{Comm}\,(\Pi\otimes\Pi\,(K))\cap\mathrm{Herm}\,(\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H})$, $|\psi_0\rangle$is the highest weight vector and vectors $|\psi_\lambda\rangle$ranges over all weight vectors of the representation Π in $\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. We first note that by the virtue of Lemma 5.1 it is enough to consider

$$V\in\mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathbb{C}\,[\Pi\otimes\Pi\,(K)])\cap\mathrm{Herm}\,(\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H})$$

that satisfy

$$\langle\psi|\langle\phi|V|\psi\rangle|\phi\rangle\leq 0\,,$$

where $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\in\mathcal{M}$ and $|\phi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}$. Because of (5.53) and K-invariance of V the above inequality is equivalent to

$$\langle\psi_0|\langle\phi|V|\psi_0\rangle|\phi\rangle\leq 0\,, \tag{5.62}$$

for all $|\phi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}$. Decomposing the vector $|\phi\rangle$ in the basis of weight vectors (see Subsection 2.4.2 for details) we get

$$|\phi\rangle=\sum_\lambda c_\lambda|\psi_\lambda\rangle\,, \tag{5.63}$$

where the sum ranges over all weights that occur in the representation $\mathcal{H}$. Using (5.63) we get

$$\sum_{\lambda,\lambda'}c_\lambda^*c_{\lambda'}\langle\psi_0|\langle\phi_\lambda|V|\psi_0\rangle|\phi_{\lambda'}\rangle\leq 0\,. \tag{5.64}$$

[10] For the definition of weight spaces see Subsection 2.4.2.

[11] If we had dropped out the condition $\tau X\tau=X$ for $X\in\mathrm{Comm}\,(\Pi\otimes\Pi\,(K))$ we would have to impose another set of inequalities :

$$\langle\psi_\lambda|\langle\psi_0|V|\psi_\lambda\rangle|\psi_0\rangle\leq 0\,.$$

Operator V belongs to the commutant of the representation $\Pi \otimes \Pi$ in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and consequently it commutes with the representation of the associated representation of the Lie algebra $\pi \otimes \pi$ (see Eq.(2.51)) restricted to the Cartan algebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$,

$$[V, \pi \otimes \pi(H)] = 0\,, \tag{5.65}$$

where

$$\pi \otimes \pi(H) = \pi(H) \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes \pi(H)\ ,$$

for $H \in \mathfrak{h}$. From (5.65) it follows that V preserves weight spaces in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Using this and the fact that weight spaces are mutually orthogonal (see Subsection (2.4.2)) the double sum in (5.64) reduces to the single sum

$$\sum_{\lambda} |c_\lambda|^2 \langle \psi_0 | \langle \phi_\lambda | V | \psi_0 \rangle | \phi_\lambda \rangle \leq 0$$

which is equivalent to (5.61). □

We now move to the discussion of the strength of the criteria based on operators $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$. More precisely, we are interested in the following problem.

Problem 5.3. Given a mixed state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, what is the optimal strategy, based on the criterion (5.54) and $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$, that allows to detect correlations in state ρ?

Before we answer the above question we have to introduce some terminology from convex geometry (for the comprehensive introduction to the field of convex geometry see [133]). A *face* of a convex set $\mathcal{C}$ in a real vector space $\mathcal{V}$ is a nonempty convex subset, $F \subset \mathcal{C}$ with the property that if $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$, $\theta \in (0,1)$, and $\theta x + (1-\theta)y \in F$, then $x, y \in F$. An *extreme ray* $\mathcal{R}$ of a convex cone $\mathcal{C}$ is a face which is a half-line originating from the origin of the cone (a point $0 \in \mathcal{V}$). For technical reasons we restrain ourselves to so-called *finitely-generated cones* [12]i.e cones defined via,

$$\mathcal{C}_{v_1,\ldots,v_N} = \{\lambda_1 v_1 + \cdots + \lambda_N v_N |\, \lambda_i \geq 0,\, v_i \in \mathcal{V}\}\ , \tag{5.66}$$

where $\mathcal{V}$ is the ambient vector space. We will refer to vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_N$ as the generators of the cone and denote this (in general not-unique) set as $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{C})$. For a pictorial representation of a finitely-generated cone see Figure 5.2.

The following theorem characterizes the detection power of bilinear, K-invariant witnesses of correlations.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$. The following statements hold*

- *Correlations in states ρ and σ can be detected via criteria based on $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$* if and only if *there exist an operator $V \in \mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})\right)$ such that for some nonzero $V \in \mathcal{R}$*

$$\mathrm{tr}\left([\rho \otimes \sigma] V\right) > 0\,. \tag{5.67}$$

- Correlations in the state ρ can be detected are detected *via criteria based on $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$* if and only if *there exist an operator $V \in \mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})\right)$ such that*

$$\lambda_{\max}\left\{\mathrm{tr}_1\left([\rho \otimes \mathbb{I}] V\right)\right\} > 0\,, \tag{5.68}$$

where $\lambda_{\max}$ denotes the maximum eigenvalue and $\mathrm{tr}_1(\cdot)$ denotes the partial trace over first factor of the tensor product $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$.

[12] In examples that follow we will only deal with finitely-generated cones. Moreover, for finitely-generated cones it is very simple to gibe an algorithm for deciding a possible sign of a linear functional on it (see Proof of Lemma 5.4).



Figure 5.2. A graphical presentation of an exemplary finitely-generated cone generated by vectors $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 \in \mathbb{R}^3$. The cone $\mathcal{C}_{v_1,v_2,v_3,v_4}$ consists of all linear combinations of vectors v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 with non-negative coefficients.

Proof. Let us first prove the first statement. Since $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ is finitely-generated (this follows from the fact that it is given by the intersection of finitely many inequalities (5.61)), every element of $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ can be written as a non-negative combination of elements from the generating set

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i V_i \,,$$

where $\lambda_i \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})\right) = \{V_1, \ldots, V_n\}$. Due to the homogeneity of condition (5.54) in V, we can without the loss of generality assume that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i = 1$. This condition cuts out in the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ a polytope which we denote by Δ. For a given states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$, the mapping

$$V \to \mathrm{tr}\left([\rho \otimes \sigma]\, V\right) \,,$$

is a linear function on $\mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$. This function, when restricted to Δ, attains its maximum on vertices of Δ. From the definition of $\mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})\right)$ it follows that vertices of Δ are contained in $\mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})\right)$. This finishes the proof of the first statement.

Proof of the second statement is straightforward. From arguments given above it follows that criterion based on $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ will detect correlations in the state ρ if and only if

$$\max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})} \max_{V \in \mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})\right)} \mathrm{tr}\left([\rho \otimes \sigma]\, V\right) > 0 \,.$$

The order of max operators can be inverted. The maximum over states $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ can be computed using the following identity, valid for all $V \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$,

$$\max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})} \mathrm{tr}\left([\rho \otimes \sigma]\, V\right) = \max_{\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})} \mathrm{tr}\left(\sigma \mathrm{tr}_1\left([\rho \otimes \mathbb{I}]\, V\right)\right) \,. \tag{5.69}$$

Right-hand side of (5.69) equals $\lambda_{\max}\left\{\mathrm{tr}_1\left([\rho \otimes \mathbb{I}]\, V\right)\right\}$ which follows from the linearity of

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\sigma \mathrm{tr}_1\left([\rho \otimes \mathbb{I}]\, V\right)\right)$$

in σ. This concludes the proof of (5.68). □

Theorem 5.3 together with Lemma 5.4 give a constructive algorithm to describe the structure of $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ and to gauge the power of criteria based on it. The procedure is the following

1. Describe the structure of the commutant $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi\otimes\Pi\left(K\right)\right)$ (find its basis or a generating set)
2. Use inequalities (5.61) to find a generating set of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^K\left(\mathcal{M}\right)$.
3. Apply Lemma 5.4 to gauge the strength of the criteria based on $\mathcal{W}_2^K\left(\mathcal{M}\right)$.

In the next four subsections we will apply the above algorithm to four physically-motivated classes of correlations.

5.3.2. Entanglement of distinguishable particles

In this part we describe in detail the structure of the set $\mathcal{W}_2^K\left(\mathcal{M}\right)$ in the context of detecting standard entanglement in the system of L distinguishable particles. The relevant class of pure states $\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{M}_d$ consists of pure product states (see Eq.(3.20)). In what follows we will use the notation introduced in Subsection 3.1.1. Recall that the symmetry group in the context of entanglement is the local unitary group $K=\mathrm{LU}=\times_{i=1}^{i=L}SU(N_i)$ irreducibly represented on a Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}_d=\mathcal{H}_1\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathcal{H}_L=\mathbb{C}^{N_1}\otimes\ldots\otimes\mathbb{C}^{N_L}=\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L}\mathbb{C}^{N_i}\,,$$

via the tensor product of the defining representations of $\mathrm{SU}(N_i)$,

$$\Pi_d(U_1\ldots,U_L)=U_1\otimes\cdots\otimes U_L\,.$$

It will be convenient for us to use the identification of multiple tensor products

$$\mathcal{H}_d\otimes\mathcal{H}_d=\bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L}\left(\mathcal{H}_i\otimes\mathcal{H}_{i'}\right)\,, \tag{5.70}$$

where we label spaces from the second copy of the total space with primes in order to avoid ambiguity (note that (5.70) is analogous to the notation introduced in Subsection 3.3.3). Let $\mathbb{S}_{ii'}:\mathcal{H}_i\otimes\mathcal{H}_{i'}\to\mathcal{H}_i\otimes\mathcal{H}_{i'}$ be the swap operation flipping the factors of $\mathcal{H}_i\otimes\mathcal{H}_{i'}$ and let $\mathbb{I}_{ii'}:\mathcal{H}_i\otimes\mathcal{H}_{i'}\to\mathcal{H}_i\otimes\mathcal{H}_{i'}$ be the identity operator in this space. Note that under the above identification the tensor product of representation Π_d takes a convenient form

$$\Pi_d\otimes\Pi_d(U_1\ldots,U_L)=\bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L}\left(U_i\otimes U_i\right)\,. \tag{5.71}$$

The following lemma characterizes the commutant of the representation $\Pi_d\otimes\Pi_d$ in $\mathcal{H}_{dist}\otimes\mathcal{H}_{dist}$.

Lemma 5.5. *The commutant* $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_d\otimes\Pi_d\left(\mathrm{LU}\right)\right]\right)$ *is commutative. Let* $X\subset\{1,\ldots,L\}$ *be the arbitrary subset of the set* $\{1,\ldots,L\}$*. Let* $\mathbb{S}^X:\mathcal{H}_d\otimes\mathcal{H}_d\to\mathcal{H}_d\otimes\mathcal{H}_d$ *be a Hermitian operator defined by*

$$\mathbb{S}^X=\left(\bigotimes_{i\in X}\mathbb{S}_{ii'}\right)\otimes\left(\bigotimes_{i\in\bar{X}}\mathbb{I}_{ii'}\right)\,, \tag{5.72}$$

where it is understood that the relevant factors in (5.72) *act on the appropriate factors in the tensor product* (5.70) *and* $\bar{X}$ *is the complement of the set* X*.*

Operators $\mathbb{S}^X$ *for all possible choices of* X *form the basis of* $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi_d\otimes\Pi_d\left(\mathrm{LU}\right)\right)$.

Proof. Let us note that the operator algebra generated by the unitary representation $\Pi_d \otimes \Pi_d$ has the following structure

$$\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_d \otimes \Pi_d\left(\mathrm{LU}\right)\right] = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_i \otimes \Pi_i\left(\mathrm{SU}\left(N_i\right)\right)\right] , \tag{5.73}$$

where the multiple tensor product in (5.73) corresponds to the decompositions (5.70) and (5.71). Representation Π_i appearing in (5.73) is a defining representation of $\mathrm{SU}\left(N_i\right)$. From Eq.(2.97), given in Subsection (2.4.3), we have

$$\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi_i \otimes \Pi_i\left[\mathrm{SU}\left(N_i\right)\right]\right) = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}}\left\{\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{I},\, \mathbb{S}\right\} , \tag{5.74}$$

where $\mathbb{I}\otimes\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_i\otimes\mathcal{H}_i$ and $\mathbb{S}$ is the swap operator on this space. We now use the known property of a commutant discussed in Subsection 2.4.3. For any operator algebras $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ (over the field of complex numbers) $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2\right) = \mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathcal{A}_1\right) \otimes \mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathcal{A}_2\right)$. Operators $\mathbb{S}^X$ from Eq.(5.72) clearly form a basis of

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L} \mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi_i \otimes \Pi_i\left[\mathrm{SU}\left(N_i\right)\right]\right)$$

which concludes the proof. □

In what follows we will make an extensive use of operators $\mathbb{S}^X$ from Lemma 5.5. Pictorial representation of the action of $\mathbb{S}^X$ is presented in Figure on the example of $\mathbb{S}^{\{2,3\}}$.



Figure 5.3. A graphical presentation of the action of $\mathbb{S}^{\{2,3\}}$ in $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=5}\left(\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_{i'}\right)$. The operator performs the independent swaps between factors of the tentsor product enclosed by black curves.

In particular we will use of the following well-known fact.

Fact 5.1. *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}_{dist}\right)$ and let $X \subset \{1, \ldots, L\}$. Then the following equality holds,*

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\rho \otimes \sigma\right]\mathbb{S}^X\right) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_X \sigma_X\right) , \tag{5.75}$$

where $\rho_X, \sigma_X \in \mathcal{D}\left(\bigotimes_{i\in X}\mathcal{H}_i\right)$ are reduction of the states ρ, σ to the subsystem of a composite L-partite system consisting of particles labeled indices belonging to the subset X.

Lemma 5.6. *Every* LU*-invariant bilinear entanglement witness V ($V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}\left(\mathcal{M}_{dist}\right)$) for L distinguishable particles has the structure*

$$V = \sum_{X\subset\{1,\ldots,L\}} a_X \mathbb{S}^X , \tag{5.76}$$

where $a_X \in \mathbb{R}$ are real parameters labeled by subsets of the set $\{1, \ldots, L\}$ satisfying the following inequalities (also labeled by subsets Y of the set $\{1, \ldots, L\}$),

$$\sum_{X: X\subset Y} a_X \leq 0 . \tag{5.77}$$

Proof. We will make a direct use of Theorem 5.3 as the considered scenario satisfies its assumptions. We will show that inequalities (5.77) are equivalent, in this particular example, to inequalities (5.61). Let us fix some orthonormal bases

$$\left\{|e_j^{(i)}\rangle\right\}_{j=1}^{j=N_j}\,,\; i=1,\ldots,L$$

of the spaces $\mathcal{H}_i$ composing the full tensor product $\mathcal{H}_{dist}=\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L}\mathcal{H}_i$. As a highest weight state $|\psi_0\rangle$ of LU we take

$$|\psi_0\rangle=\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L}|e_1^{(i)}\rangle\,. \tag{5.78}$$

As weight vectors we can take (see Subsection 2.4.2) standard product vectors in $\mathcal{H}_d$,

$$|\psi_\lambda\rangle=|e_{j_1}^{(1)}\rangle\otimes|e_{j_2}^{(2)}\rangle\otimes\ldots\otimes|e_{j_L}^{(L)}\rangle\,, \tag{5.79}$$

where the parameter λ encodes the subsequent subscripts $j_1,\ldots,j_L$ and thus we write $\lambda=(j_1,\ldots,j_L)$. To every λ we associate an auxiliary set $X_\lambda\subset\{1,\ldots,L\}$ defined as follows,

$$X_\lambda=\{\,i|\,j_i=1\}\,. \tag{5.80}$$

Simple calculation shows that for all $Y\subset\{1,\ldots,L\}$

$$\langle\psi_0|\langle\psi_\lambda|\mathbb{S}^Y|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_\lambda\rangle=\begin{cases}1 & \text{for } Y\subset X_\lambda\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}\,. \tag{5.81}$$

By the virtue of Lemma 5.5 every operator

$$V\in\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_{dist}\otimes\Pi_{dist}\left(\mathrm{LU}\right)\right]\right)\cap\mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}_{dist}\otimes\mathcal{H}_{dist}\right)$$

can be written as

$$V=\sum_{X\subset\{1,\ldots,L\}}a_X\mathbb{S}^X\,,$$

where $a_X\in\mathbb{R}$ are real parameters. Inequalities (5.77) follow from applying to the above expression inequalities (5.61), Eq.(5.81) and by noting that as we range over all λ, subsets X_λ range over all possible subsets of $\{1,\ldots,L\}$. □

It turns out that inequalities (5.77) are independent. Moreover, it is possible to compute extreme rays of the cone given by them explicitly. This is settled by the following lemma

Lemma 5.7. *The following operators form a generating set of the cone* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}\left(\mathcal{M}_d\right)$*,*

$$V^Y=-\left(-1\right)^{|Y|}\sum_{X:X\supset Y}\left(-1\right)^{|X|}\mathbb{S}^X\,, \tag{5.82}$$

where $Y\subset\{1,\ldots,L\}$*,* $|\cdot|$ *denotes the cardinality of a discrete set and the summation is over all subsets of* $\{1,\ldots,L\}$ *that contain the set* Y*. Moreover, half-lines in* $\mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}_d\otimes\mathcal{H}_d\right)$ *passing through the null operator and one of the operators* V^Y *form* 2^L *extreme rays of the cone* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}\left(\mathcal{M}_d\right)$*.*

Consequently, entanglement of states $\rho,\sigma\in\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}_d\right)$ *can be detected by criterion based on operators belonging to* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}\left(\mathcal{M}_d\right)$ *if and only if*

$$\max_{Y\subset\{1,\ldots,L\}}\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\rho\otimes\sigma\right]V^Y\right)>0\,, \tag{5.83}$$

Moreover, entanglement of $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_d)$ *can be detected by* $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$ *if and only if*

$$\max_{Y \subset \{1,\ldots,L\}} \lambda_{\max} \left\{ \mathrm{tr}_1 \left([\rho \otimes \mathbb{I}] \, V^Y \right) \right\} > 0 \,, \tag{5.84}$$

where notation in (5.84) *is the same as in* (5.68).

Proof. The proof that the generating set of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$ is given by operators (5.82) follows from the fact that the following linear transformation is invertible

$$b_Y = \sum_{X : X \subset Y} a_X \,, \tag{5.85}$$

where $\{a_X\}_{X \subset \{1,\ldots,L\}}$ and $\{b_Y\}_{Y \subset \{1,\ldots,L\}}$ are 2^L dimensional real vectors whose coordinates are labeled by subsets of the set $\{1, \ldots, L\}$. The inverse formula to (5.85) is given by the well-known inclusion-exclusion principle [134],

$$a_X = \sum_{Y : Y \subset X} (-1)^{|X|+|Y|} \, b_Y \,. \tag{5.86}$$

The invertibility of (5.85) ensures that in the new variables $\{b_Y\}_{Y \subset \{1,\ldots,L\}}$ the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$ is simply the intersection of half-spaces

$$b_Y \leq 0 \,, \tag{5.87}$$

for $Y \subset \{1, \ldots, L\}$. In these new variables the generating vectors $V^{\tilde{Y}}$ of $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$ obviously have coordinates of the form $b_Y = -\delta_{Y,\tilde{Y}}$, where $\delta_{Y,\tilde{Y}}$ denotes the Kronecker delta. Using this relation and inserting it to the inverse formula (5.86) we get the "old" coordinates of V^Y,

$$a_X = - \sum_{Y : Y \subset X} (-1)^{|X|+|Y|} \, \delta_{Y,\tilde{Y}} = \begin{cases} -(-1)^{|X|+|\tilde{Y}|} & \text{for } \tilde{Y} \subset X \\ 0 & \text{otherwivse} \end{cases} .$$

Inserting the above to (5.76) we obtain (5.82). The proof of the fact that operators V^Y define the extreme rays of $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$ is immediate. The statements that proceed Eq.(5.83) and Eq.(5.84) follow from Lemma 5.4. □

5.3.3. Particle entanglement of bosons

In this subsection we analyze in detail the set $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ for the case of particle entanglement of L bosonic particles. We will consequently recall the notation and terminology from Subsection 3.1.2. The appropriate class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ is $\mathcal{M}_b$ consisting of bosonic product states (see Eq.(3.25)). The relevant symmetry group in this context is the "bosonic local unitary group" $\mathrm{LU}_b = \mathrm{SU}(d)$, irreducibly represented on a L-boson Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}_b = \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \;,\; \mathcal{H} \approx \mathbb{C}^d$$

via the representation

$$\Pi_b(U) = \overbrace{U \otimes \ldots \otimes U}^{L \text{ times}} \,.$$

We will use the following embedding of multiple tensor products

$$\mathcal{H}_b \otimes \mathcal{H}_b \subset \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} (\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_{i'}) \;, \tag{5.88}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_i \approx \mathcal{H}_{i'} \approx \mathbb{C}^d$. Note that under the above identification the tensor product of representation Π_b takes a convenient form

$$\Pi_b \otimes \Pi_b(U) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} (U \otimes U) \ . \tag{5.89}$$

Just like in the case of distinguishable particles the commutant of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ in $\mathcal{H}_b \otimes \mathcal{H}_b$ turns out to be commutative.

Lemma 5.8. *The commutant* $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_b \otimes \Pi_b\left(\mathrm{LU}_b\right)\right]\right)$ *is commutative. Let* $k = 0, \ldots, L$ *and let* $\mathbb{S}_b^k : \mathcal{H}_b \otimes \mathcal{H}_b \to \mathcal{H}_b \otimes \mathcal{H}_b$ *be a Hermitian operator defined by*[13]

$$\mathbb{S}_b^k = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \left[\left(\bigotimes_{i \in X} \mathbb{S}_{ii'} \right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i \in \bar{X}} \mathbb{I}_{ii'} \right) \right] \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} , \tag{5.90}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes L} \to \mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$ *is an orthonormal projector onto* $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H})$ *and* $X \subset \{1, \ldots, L\}$ *is a subset*[14] *having the cardinality* m. *Operators* $\mathbb{S}_b^m$ *for* $k = 0, \ldots, L$ *span* $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi_b \otimes \Pi_b\left(\mathrm{LU}_b\right)\right)$.

Proof. The proof is presented in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 165). □

Although the formula (5.90) for the operator $\mathbb{S}_b^k$ may seem to be quite complicated, the physical interpretation of $\mathbb{S}_b^m$ is actually very simple. It is due to the following simple fact.

Fact 5.2. *([17]) Let* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_b)$ *be a state of system consisting of* L *bosons. Due to the embedding*[15] $\mathcal{H}_b \subset \mathcal{H}_d$ *the sate* ρ *can be treated as a state of* L *distinguishable identical particles,* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_d)$. *Let* ρ_X *denote a reduced density matrix describing the subsystem of* L*-partite system consisting of particles labeled by indices belonging to the subset* $X \subset \{1, \ldots, L\}$. *For all* $X \subset \{1, \ldots, L\}$ *satisfying* $|X| = k$ *the reduced state* ρ_X *is the same and depends only on the integer* k,

$$\rho_X = \rho_{(k)} , \tag{5.91}$$

where $\rho_{(k)} \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$.

Using Facts 5.1 and 5.2 we obtain the following formula,

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\rho \otimes \sigma\right] \mathbb{S}_b^k\right) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_{(k)} \sigma_{(k)}\right) , \tag{5.92}$$

where $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_b)$ and $\rho_{(k)}, \sigma_{(k)} \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$ are as in (5.91). Equation (5.92) specifies the operator $\mathbb{S}_b^k$ uniquely and gives it a physical interpretation.

We now proceed with the description of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}_b}(\mathcal{M}_b)$ consisting of LU_b-invariant bilinear witnesses of particle entanglement for bosonic systems.

Lemma 5.9. *Every* LU_b*-invariant bilinear particle-entanglement witness* V *(*$V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}_b}(\mathcal{M}_b)$*) for* L *bosonic particles has the structure*

$$V = \sum_{k=0}^{L} a_k \mathbb{S}_b^k , \tag{5.93}$$

[13] We use the embedding (5.88) and the analogous to that of Eq. (5.72).

[14] The definition of $\mathbb{S}^m$ does not depend upon the choice of $X \subset \{1, \ldots, L\}$ provided it has the cardinality equal k.

[15] We have in mind a trivial embedding $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes L}$.

where $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ $(k = 0, \ldots, L)$ *are real parameters satisfying the following* $L+1$ *inequalities*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{\binom{L}{k}} a_k \leq 0\,, \tag{5.94}$$

parametrized by integers $n = 0, \ldots, L$.

Proof. We prove 5.9 in an analogous way as Theorem 5.6. The detailed proof is given in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 166). □

Just like in the case of distinguishable particles inequalities (5.94) are independent and it is possible to give a precise structure of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_b}}(\mathcal{M}_b)$.

Lemma 5.10. *The following operators form a generating set of the cone* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_b}}(\mathcal{M}_b)$,

$$V_b^m = -(-1)^m \sum_{k:k\geq m} \binom{L}{k}\binom{k}{m} (-1)^k \mathbb{S}_b^k\,, \tag{5.95}$$

where $m = 0, \ldots, L$. *Moreover, half-lines in* $\mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H}_b \otimes \mathcal{H}_b)$ *passing through the null operator and one of the operators* V_b^m *form* $L+1$ *extreme rays of the cone* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_b}}(\mathcal{M}_b)$.

Consequently, particle entanglement of states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_b)$ *can be detected by some* $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_b}}(\mathcal{M}_b)$ *if and only if*

$$\max_{0\leq m\leq L} \mathrm{tr}\left([\rho\otimes\sigma]\, V_b^m\right) > 0\,. \tag{5.96}$$

Moreover, entanglement of $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_b)$ *can be detected via criteria based on* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_b}}(\mathcal{M}_b)$ *if and only if*

$$\max_{0\leq m\leq L} \lambda_{\max}\left\{\mathrm{tr}_1\left([\rho\otimes\mathbb{I}]\, V_b^m\right)\right\} > 0\,, \tag{5.97}$$

where the notation in (5.97) *is the same as in* (5.68).

Proof. The proof is presented in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 167). □

Remark. From the proof of Lemma 5.10 we get as a corollary that operators $\mathbb{S}_b^k$, $k = 0, \ldots, L$ form the basis of $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_b \otimes \Pi_b\left(\mathrm{LU_b}\right)\right]\right)$.

Due to the fact that L boson state ρ is particle-entangled if and only if it is entangled, when treated as a state of L distinguishable particles, criteria based on operators $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$ can be applied to the bosonic scenario. The following proposition shows that criteria for detection of bosonic particle entanglement based on $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_b}}(\mathcal{M}_b)$ are always restrictions of criteria based on $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$ valid for entanglement of distinguishable particles.

Proposition 5.5. *Extremal rays* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_b}}(\mathcal{M}_b)$ *(given by Eq.*(5.95)*) coincide with extremal rays of* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$ *(given by Eq.* (5.82)*) when the latter are restricted to the space* $\mathcal{H}_b \otimes \mathcal{H}_b \subset \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d$.

Proof. The proof is presented in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 168). □

We would like to stress that even though the result of Proposition 5.5 may seem to be "intuitive", it does not follow imminently from definitions of cones $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_b}}(\mathcal{M}_b)$ and $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$. In principle it might have happened that criteria based on $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_b}}(\mathcal{M}_b)$ detect entanglement of bosonic states more effectively then simply restrictions of criteria based on $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$.

5.3.4. "Entanglement" of fermions

In this subsection we consider the structure of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ for the case of "entanglement" (correlations that go beyond merely antisymmetrization) in the system of L fermions. We will adopt the notation and the terminology from Subsection 3.1.3. The appropriate class of pure states $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_f$ consists of projectors onto Slater determinants (see Eq.(3.30)). The relevant symmetry group in this context is the "fermionic local unitary group" $\mathrm{LU}_f = \mathrm{SU}(N)$, irreducibly represented on a L-fermion Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}_f = \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) \ , \ \mathcal{H} \approx \mathbb{C}^{Nd}$$

via the representation

$$\Pi_f(U) = \overbrace{U \otimes \ldots \otimes U}^{L \text{ times}} \ .$$

It will be convenient for us to use the following embedding of multiple tensor products

$$\mathcal{H}_f \otimes \mathcal{H}_f \subset \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} (\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_{i'}) \ , \tag{5.98}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_i \approx \mathcal{H}_{i'} \approx \mathbb{C}^d$. Note that under the above identification the tensor product of representation Π_f takes the convenient form

$$\Pi_f \otimes \Pi_f(U) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} (U \otimes U) \ . \tag{5.99}$$

Just like in the cases considered before, the commutant of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$ in $\mathcal{H}_f \otimes \mathcal{H}_f$ turns out to be commutative.

Lemma 5.11. *The commutant* $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_f \otimes \Pi_f(\mathrm{LU}_f)\right]\right)$ *is commutative. Let* $k = 0, \ldots, L$ *and let* $\mathbb{S}_f^k : \mathcal{H}_f \otimes \mathcal{H}_f \to \mathcal{H}_f \otimes \mathcal{H}_f$ *be a Hermitian operator defined by*[16]

$$\mathbb{S}_f^k = \mathbb{P}^{asym} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{asym} \left[\left(\bigotimes_{i \in X} \mathbb{S}_{ii'} \right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i \in \bar{X}} \mathbb{I}_{ii'} \right) \right] \mathbb{P}^{asym} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{asym} \ , \tag{5.100}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}} : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes L} \to \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H})$ *is an orthonormal projector onto* $\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H})$ *and* $X \subset \{1, \ldots, L\}$ *is a subset*[17] *having the cardinality* m. *Operators* $\mathbb{S}_f^m$ *for* $k = 0, \ldots, L$ *span* $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi_f \otimes \Pi_f(\mathrm{LU}_f)\right)$.

Proof. The proof is presented alongside the proof of Lemma 5.8 in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 165). □

Operators $\mathbb{S}_f^k$, just like their bosonic counterparts have an appealing physical interpretation.

Fact 5.3. *([17]) Let* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_f)$ *be a state of the system consisting of* L *fermions. Due to the embedding*[18] $\mathcal{H}_f \subset \mathcal{H}_{dist}$ *the sate* ρ *can be treated as a state of* L *distinguishable identical particles,* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{dist})$. *Let* ρ_X *denote a reduced density matrix describing the subsystem of* L*-particle system consisting of particles labeled by indices belonging to the subset*

[16] We use the embedding (5.98) and the analogous to that of Eq. (5.72).

[17] The definition of $\mathbb{S}_f^m$ does not depend upon the choice of $X \subset \{1, \ldots, L\}$ provided it has the cardinality equal k.

[18] We have in mind a trivial embedding $\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes L}$.

$X \subset \{1,\ldots,L\}$. *For all* $X \subset \{1,\ldots,L\}$ *satisfying* $|X| = k$ *the reduced state* ρ_X *is the same and depends only on the integer* k*,*

$$\rho_X = \rho_{(k)}\,, \tag{5.101}$$

where $\rho_{(k)} \in \mathcal{D}\left(\bigwedge^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$.

Usisng Facts 5.1 and 5.3 we get,

$$\mathrm{tr}\left([\rho\otimes\sigma]\,\mathbb{S}_f^k\right) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_{(k)}\sigma_{(k)}\right)\,, \tag{5.102}$$

where $\rho,\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_f)$ and $\rho_{(k)},\sigma_{(k)} \in \mathcal{D}\left(\bigwedge^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$ are as in (5.101). Equation (5.102) specifies the operator $\mathbb{S}_f^k$ uniquely and gives it a physical interpretation.

We now proceed with the description of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}_f}(\mathcal{M}_f)$ consisting of LU_f-invariant bilinear witnesses of "entanglement" in L-fermion systems. In what follows, for the sake of simplicity, we restrict our considerations to the case $2L \leq d$. The relaxation of assumption is possible but makes computations cumbersome.

Lemma 5.12. *Assume that* $2L \leq d$*. Then, every* LU_f*-invariant bilinear correlation* V *(*$V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}_f}(\mathcal{M}_f)$*) for* L *fermionic particles has the structure*

$$V = \sum_{k=0}^{L} a_k \mathbb{S}_f^k\,, \tag{5.103}$$

where $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ *(*$k = 0,\ldots,L$*) are real parameters satisfying the following* $L+1$ *inequalities*

$$\sum_{k\leq n} \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{\binom{L}{k}^2} a_k \leq 0\,, \tag{5.104}$$

parametrized by integers $n = 0,\ldots,L$.

Proof. The proof is presented in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 133). □

In analogy to the previously considered cases we exploit inequalities (5.104) to describe the structure of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}_f}(\mathcal{M}_f)$

Lemma 5.13. *Assume that* $2L \leq d$ *then, the following operators form a generating set of the cone* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU_f}}(\mathcal{M}_f)$*,*

$$V_f^m = -(-1)^m \sum_{k:k\geq m} \binom{L}{k}^2 \binom{k}{m} (-1)^k\, \mathbb{S}_f^k\,, \tag{5.105}$$

where $m = 0,\ldots,L$*. Moreover, half-lines in* $\mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H}_f\otimes\mathcal{H}_f)$ *passing through the null operator and one of the operators* V_f^m *form* $L+1$ *extreme rays of the cone* $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}_f}(\mathcal{M}_f)$*.*

Consequently, particle entanglement of states $\rho,\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_f)$ *can be detected by some* $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}_f}(\mathcal{M}_f)$ *if and only if*

$$\max_{0\leq m\leq L} \mathrm{tr}\left([\rho\otimes\sigma]\,V_f^m\right) > 0\,. \tag{5.106}$$

Moreover, entanglement of $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_f)$ *can be detected via criteria based on* $V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}_f}(\mathcal{M}_f)$ *if and only if*

$$\max_{0\leq m\leq L} \lambda_{\max}\left\{\mathrm{tr}_1\left([\rho\otimes\mathbb{I}]\,V_f^m\right)\right\} > 0\,, \tag{5.107}$$

where notation in (5.107) *is the same as in* (5.68)*.*

Idea of the proof. The proof of Lemma 5.13 is completely analogous to the proof of Lemmas 5.7 and 5.10. Just like in the case of distinguishable particles and bosons one gets that under the assumption $2L \leq d$ the operators $\mathbb{S}_f^k$ $(k = 0, \ldots, L)$ form a basis of $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi_f \otimes \Pi_f\left(\mathrm{LU}_f\right)\right)$. $\square$

We would like to remark that, unlike in the case of entanglement of bosons discussed in Subsection 5.3.3, the correlation criteria based on operators V_f^m (5.105) cannot be deduced from the entanglement criteria derived in Subsection 5.3.2. The main reason for that is simple: non-correlated pure fermionic sates $\mathcal{M}_f \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_f\right)$ are automatically entangled, when treated as pure states on an "auxiliary" Hilbert space of L distinguishable particles $\mathcal{H}_{dist} = \left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)^{\otimes L}$.

5.3.5. Not convex-Gaussian correlations

In this subsection we describe the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^K\left(\mathcal{M}\right)$ in the case when the correlations in question are "not convex-Gaussian" (see Section 1.1 and Subsection 3.1.5). The relevant class of pure states that defines our notion of correlations consists of pure fermionic Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g$ (See Eq.(3.3)). In what follows we will use extensively the notation and facts from Subsection 3.1.5. The relevant symmetry group $K = \mathrm{Spin}\left(2d\right)$ is represented in a d mode fermionic Fock space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ via Π_s (the group of Bogolyubov transformations). Recall that pure fermionic Gaussian states does not form a single orbit of$\mathrm{Spin}\left(2d\right)$. Instead we have

$$\mathcal{M}_g = \mathcal{M}_g^+ \cup \mathcal{M}_g^- \,, \tag{5.108}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_g^{\pm} \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^{\pm}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ are highest-weight orbits of $\mathrm{Spin}\left(2d\right)$ which is represented, via representations $\Pi_s^{\pm}$ in Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^{\pm}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ (see Section 2.4.4). For the sake of clarity and in order to avoid unnecessary technical complications we will describe only the case when $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_g^+$ and the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. The case of $\mathcal{M}_g^-$ can be treated analogously. From the physical perspective studing solely $\mathcal{M}_g^+$ and restricting to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ amounts to imposing the parity superselection rule and restricting considerations to fermionic states characterized by the total party Q equal one.

We proceed analogously as in the previous three subsections by first describing the structure of the commutant $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi_s^+ \otimes \Pi_s^+\left(\mathrm{Spin}\left(2d\right)\right)\right)$. Then, with the help of Theorem 5.3, we describe analytically the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{Spin}(2d)}\left(\mathcal{M}_g^+\right)$ consisting of bilinear witnesses of non-Gaussian correlations being invariant under the group of Bogolyubov transformations in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ (realized by the representation Π_s^+ of the group $\mathrm{Spin}\left(2d\right)$).

Lemma 5.14. *The commutant* $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi_s^+ \otimes \Pi_s^+\left(\mathrm{Spin}\left(2d\right)\right)\right)$ *is commutative. The basis of* $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\Pi_s^+ \otimes \Pi_s^+\left(\mathrm{Spin}\left(2d\right)\right)\right)$ *consists of operators* $\mathbb{C}_k$ *(*$k = 0, \ldots \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor$*) defined by*

$$\mathbb{C}_k = \mathbb{P}_+ \left(\sum_{\substack{X \subset \{1, \ldots, 2d\} \\ |X| = 2k}} \prod_{i \in X} c_i \otimes c_i \right) \mathbb{P}_+, \tag{5.109}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_+ = \frac{1}{4}\left(\mathbb{I} + Q\right) \otimes \left(\mathbb{I} + Q\right)$ *is the orthonormal projector*[19] *onto* $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$.

[19] In principle we could have written expression for $\mathbb{C}_k$ explicitly. However, the resulting expressions are more complitated and will not be used by us.

Proof. The proof of the proposition is technical and relies on the structure of the commutant of the representation of the group Pin $(2d)$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\otimes\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. The details of the reasoning will be presented in Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 169). □

Using the above Proposition and Theorem 5.3 we get the following characterization of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\text{Spin}(2d)}\left(\mathcal{M}_g^+\right)$.

Lemma 5.15. *Every* Spin $(2d)$*-invariant bilinear witness* V *detecting non-convex-Gaussian correlations in* $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$,$V \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\text{Spin}(2d)}\left(\mathcal{M}_g^+\right)$*, has the structure*

$$V = \sum_{k=0}^{\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor} a_k \mathbb{C}_k \,, \tag{5.110}$$

where $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ $(k = 0, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor)$ *are real parameters satisfying the following* $\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + 1$ *inequalities*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor} b_k^n a_k \leq 0 \,, \tag{5.111}$$

$$b_k^n = (-1)^k \sum_{m=0}^{\min\{2n,k\}} (-2)^m \binom{d-m}{k-m}\binom{2n}{m} \,, \tag{5.112}$$

parametrized by the integer $n = 0, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor$.

Proof. The proof of Lemma 5.15 is technical and completely analogous to the proof of Lemma 5.6. We present the detailed reasoning in the Section 8.3 of the Appendix (see page 171). □

Unlike to cases previously considered in this section, we were not able to obtain a closed-form formulas for coefficients b_k^n. However the numerical investigations carried out for $d = 4, \ldots, 1000$ show that the $\left(\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + 1\right) \times \left(\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + 1\right)$ matrix $B = [b_k^n]$ is invertible and therefore we conjecture that results analogous to those given in Lemmas 5.7, 5.10 and 5.13 hold also for arbitrary number of modes in the context of fermionic Gaussian states.

5.3.6. Discussion

In this part we discuss the results obtained in this Section. We have described completely the structure of cones of group invariant bilinear correlation witnesses $\mathcal{W}_2^K\left(\mathcal{M}\right)$ detecting correlations four classes of correlations: entanglement of distinguishable particles, particle entanglement of bosons, "entanglement" of fermions and non-Gaussian correlations in fermionic systems. In each of these cases we proved that $\mathcal{W}_2^K\left(\mathcal{M}\right)$ is a finitely generated cone and we provided the inequalities generating it (see Theorem 5.3 and Lemmas 5.6, 5.9, 5.12 and 5.15). We have also derived the extremal rays of the cones in question. This allowed us to gauge, in each of the considered cases, the ultimate strength of the obtained criteria (they are given in Lemmas[20] 5.7, 5.10 and 5.13). Let us first remark that due to equations (5.75), (5.92) and (8.54) the criteria given by equations (5.82), (5.95) and (5.105) can be understood as the inequalities which are linear in the linear entropy[21] of reduced density matrices of a state ρ in question and have to

[20] For the case of non-Gaussian fermionic correlations we did not present an explicit analytical formula. However, the extreme rays of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\text{Spin}(2d)}\left(\mathcal{M}_g^+\right)$were obtained numerically number of modes up to $d = 1000$.

[21] A linear entropy of a state is defined by $S_L\left(\rho\right) = 1 - \text{tr}\left(\rho^2\right)$

be satisfied if ρ is uncorrelated. Let us remark that it is possible to consider a smaller cone $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_2^K(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$consisting of bilinear K-invariant entanglement witnesses which are exact on pure states in the following sense

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes 2}\right] \mathrm{V}\right) = 0 \iff |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}\,.$$

However, for the sake of simplicity, we did not consider the cone $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ here. Let us now present a connection between presented results and the existing literature.

- For the case of entanglement the inequality of the type (5.82) was derived in [135]. Similar inequalities were also used in [67, 68] in the context of founding lower bound for the convex roof of the generalized concurrence.
- Upon completion of the presented work we realized that [136] contains a family of criteria equivalent to the ones given by (5.82). In [136] it was proven that the this criteria are in general more powerful than the reduction criterion but nevertheless do not detect PPT entangled states. However, in (5.82) there was no discussion of the optimality of the obtained criteria. The discussion contained in Subsection 5.3.1 shows that inequalities (5.82) correspond to extreme rays of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^{\mathrm{LU}}(\mathcal{M}_d)$ and therefore can be considered as optimal.
- To our knowledge, the criteria for correlations in fermionic systems analogous to these given in Lemmas 5.12 and 5.15 have not been presented before.

Much of the discussion presented in this section can be transferred to the case when $\mathcal{H}$ is infinite-dimensional. In particular correlation criteria derived in Subsections 5.3.2, 5.3.3 and 5.3.4 remain valid when single particle Hilbert spaces are general separable Hilbert spaces (the setting considered in Section 3.2).

5.4. Summary and open problems

In the present chapter we have developed a collection of multilinear witnesses detecting entanglement and its generalizations. The research presented here was built-up on two observations:

- A number of classes of pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ that give rise to physically-interesting notions of correlations can be characterized by a polynomial condition in the state's density matrix (the thorough discussion of this construction was given in Chapter 3);
- Many types of correlations are invariant under the action of the relevant symmetry group of the problem.

The following list summarizes the main results presented in this chapter.

- **Section 5.1**. A general bilinear witness for detection of correlations defined via the choice of the class of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ given as a zero set of a polynomial quadratic is state's density matrix. The criterion based on a bilinear witness is given in Theorem 5.1. The criterion is applied to the problem of detection of the following classes of correlations: entanglement of distinguishable particles, particle entanglement of bosons, "entanglement" of fermions, non-Gaussian correlations in fermionic systems.
- **Section 5.2**. A general k-linear witness for detection of correlations defined via the choice of the class of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ given as a zero set of a polynomial of degree k in state's density matrix. The criterion based on a k-linear witness is given in Theorem 5.2. The criterion is applied to the problem of detection of Genuine Multiparty Entanglement and Schmidt number of quantum states.

- **Section 5.3**. Description of the structure of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ of bilinear group-invariant correlation witness for cases when the class $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is an orbit of the action of a compact simply-connected Lie group K represented irreducibly on $\mathcal{H}$. The complete description of the cone $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$ of the corresponding criteria is presented for the following types of correlations: entanglement of distinguishable particles, particle entanglement of bosons, "entanglement" of fermions, non-Gaussian correlations in fermionic systems. The criteria obtained in Section 5.1 are, by definition, special cases of criteria based on operators belonging to $\mathcal{W}_2^K(\mathcal{M})$.

Open problems

Below we give a number of open problems related to the content of this Chapter.

- Describe the cone of group-invariant 2-linear correlation witnesses for classes of coherent states $\mathcal{M}$ relevant for quantum optics. In this context the appropriate Hilbert space is the bosonic Fock space (corresponding one mode or multiple modes). The relevant classes of coherent states are: optical coherent sates, squeezed states and pure bosonic Gaussian states. Each of these classes is an orbit of the appropriate symmetry group: the Heisenberg group [19], Metaplectic group [25] and affine-Metaplectic group [25] receptively. The main technical difficulty that appears while studying representations of these groups in bosonic Fock space comes from the fact that this Hilbert space is infinite-dimensional. Consequently, it is necessary to take into account the functional-theoretic aspects of the considered problem.
- Describe the cone of group-invariant k-linear entanglement witness for $k > 2$. This problem becomes much more difficult than the one considered in Section 5.3 due to the fact that the commutant of the action of the relevant groups in $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$ is no longer commutative.
- Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ denote the class of coherent states of a compact simply-connected Lie group K in the representation Π characterized by the highest weight λ_0. The set of all mixed states $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ stratifies onto orbits of the action of K given by

$$k.\rho = \Pi(k)\,\rho\Pi(k)^{\dagger}\ ,$$

where $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ and $k \in K$. The sets of non-correlated states $\mathcal{M}^c$ is the union of the orbits of the group K. Therefore it is possible, in principle, to decide about the correlations in a state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)$ by looking solely on the polynomial invariants of the action of K in ρ (for the excellent exposition of the theory of group-invariant polynomials in the context of entanglement see [33, 34]). It is now a natural question to ask what relations between values of polynomial invariants allow to infer about correlations in a state ρ. In Section 5.3 we have solved this problem completely but only for the invariants of the particular form $\mathrm{tr}\left([\rho^{\otimes 2}]\ V\right)$. Obviously this problem is of the greatest interest in the context of entanglement.

6. Typical properties of correlations

In Chapter 3 we have established a polynomial characterization of various kinds of pure "non-correlated" states. In Chapter 5 we derived a variety of polynomial-based criteria for detection of correlation in mixed states. Recall that we call a mixed state correlated if and only if it is not possible to express it as a convex combination of pure states from a distinguished class of "non-correlated" pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ (see Section 1.1 for the motivation for the introduction of correlations defined in this manner). In the current chapter we will use results obtained in Chapter 5 to study typical properties of so-defined correlations in the space of isospectral density matrices. To be more specific we will be interested in the following question.

Problem 6.1. (Typicality problem) Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be a class of "non-correlated" pure states in N dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. What fraction $\eta_{\Omega}^{\text{corr}}$ of mixed states $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ belonging to the set ofmatrices with fixed spectrum is correlated (does not belong to the convex hull $\mathcal{M}^c \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$)?

Figure 6.1 presents a graphical illustration to the above question.



Figure 6.1. Illustration of the geometry of correlated states in the space of density matrices $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. The space $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ is located inside the region bounded by the red line. For simplicity of presentation we identified the boundary of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ with space of pure states $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$. The class of pure states $\mathcal{M}$ is given by the thick blue segments laying on $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$. The class of non-correlated states, $\mathcal{M}^c$, is marked by a shaded blue region. We ask what fraction of states belonging to the space of isospectral density matrix Ω (marked by a black loop) is correlated (does not belong to $\mathcal{M}^c$).

Before moving to a more rigorous formulation of the above problem let us first give a motivation for our considerations.

- In many cases it is difficult to infer (due to the lack of knowledge about the state or the experimental difficulties) about the correlations for a particular state of interest. However, answer to the question posed in the Problem 6.1 may allow to infer about the correlation

properties of a given state "with high probability" (see discussion bellow), assuming that we have the knowledge only about its spectrum.

- Consider a bipartite state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$. It is known that there exists a dichotomy between entanglement and the purity $\mathrm{tr}(\rho^2)$ of ρ [137, 138]. That is, the smaller the purity of ρ, the more likely ρ is to be separable. In particular there exist a critical purity P_0 such that if $\mathrm{tr}(\rho^2) \leq P_0$ the state ρ is guarantied to be separable. The Problem 6.1 can be considered as a generalization of studies pioneered in [137, 138] to a much more general context.
- Solution to Problem 6.1 gives an insight into the geometry of the inclusion $\mathcal{M}^c \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$.
- Similar problem was considered before but only in the context of quantum entanglement and for different ensembles of quantum states. Different ensembles of quantum states and the fraction of correlated states in the whole set of density matrices $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ (equipped with a suitable measure) were studied [139, 140] (see Section 6.1 below).

In the rest of this chapter we will present results that give a partial solution to the Problem 6.1 in cases when the class of "non-correlated" pure states can be defined via the polynomial condition defined in terms of a single operator $\mathrm{A} \in \mathrm{Herm}_+\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$ (see Eq.(5.1)). We will consider the uniform measure (induced from the Haar measure on the total unitary group $\mathrm{U}(\mathcal{H})$) on the set of isospectral density matrices $\Omega_{(p_1,\ldots,p_N)} \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, i.e. the set of states that posses the same (ordered) spectrum,

$$\Omega_{\{p_1,\ldots,p_N\}} = \{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \,|\mathrm{Sp}(\rho) = (p_1,\ldots,p_N)\}, \tag{6.1}$$

where $\mathrm{Sp}(\rho)$ denotes the ordered spectrum of ρ, i.e. $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \ldots \geq p_N \geq 0$.

In what follows, unless it causes a confusion, we will write $\Omega_{\{p_1,\ldots,p_N\}} \equiv \Omega$ assuming that we deal with the spectrum $(p_1,\ldots,p_N)$. We will be mostly concerned with the "thermodynamic limit" i.e. a limit when a certain relevant parameter of a system (e.g., number of particles, number of modes etc.) goes to infinity and consequently $N \to \infty$. For this reason we will use the technique of measure concentration. The phenomenon of measure concentration is a powerful tool that allows to obtain strong large deviation bounds for random variables on high-dimensional probability spaces.

The rest the chapter is organized as follows. In Section 6.1 we present elements of the theory of measure concentration and give a brief survey of the application of this technique in the field of quantum information. In Section 6.1 we apply the concentration of measure techniques and results of Section 8.3 to derive lower bounds for $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$. The chapter concludes in Section 6.3 where we discuss the obtained results and present some open problems.

Results presented in Section 6.1 have been partially published in [114]. The other results presented here will constitute the forthcoming publication

> *"Typical properties of correlations on manifolds of isospectral density matrices",* Michał Oszmaniec, et al. (in preparation),

6.1. Introduction to concentration of measure phenomenon

The phenomenon of measure concentration occurs when values of Lipschitz functions[1] defined on some probabilistic space concentrate around the value of their mean (or median). To put

[1] A function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ on a metric space X is called Lipschitz if there exist a constant $L > 0$ (called a Lipschitz constant) such that for all $x, y \in X$ $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq L \cdot d(x, y)$, where $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a metric on X.

it more precisely, measure of the set on which a function differs from its mean value in a significant way is small. Physically speaking, if measure concentration occurs on the space X (for some physical model), then in many practical applications it is enough to work with mean values rather than with functions themselves. Concentration of measure phenomenon takes place on many spaces naturally occurring in quantum mechanics (spaces of pure states $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$), manifolds of isospectral density matrices $\Omega_{(p_1,\ldots,p_N)}$). This is the reason for which the theory of measure concentration finds many applications in the quantum information theory and in foundations of quantum statistical mechanics.

The concept of measure concentration has circulated in the area of mathematics for a long time. In the year 1934 it was proved by Lévy that the so-called Gaussian concentration of measure takes place on the n dimensional sphere $\mathbb{S}^n$ equipped with the uniform measure [141]. More precisely

$$\mu\left(\{x \in \mathbb{S}^n |\, f - \mathbb{E}f \gtrless \pm\epsilon\}\right) \leq 2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{C\,(n+1)\,\epsilon^2}{L^2}\right), \tag{6.2}$$

where μ is the standard normalized measure on $\mathbb{S}^n$, $C = \frac{1}{9\pi^3 \ln(2)}$ and $\mathbb{E}f$ is the expectation value of the function f. The following example gives perhaps the most intuitive account of the idea of measure concentration. As a Lipschitz function $f(x)$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$ let us take the coordinate of a given point x (understood as an element of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$) on the axis perpendicular to some arbitrarily chosen equator and having the beginning in the center of a sphere. Average value of $f(x)$ is 0 and because of the measure concentration the bigger the dimension n, the smaller the measure of the points that are far away from the equator. In this sense we see that n sphere becomes "flatter" as $n \to \infty$.

Before we introduce the concept of measure concentration more formally we first give a short survey of its applications in quantum information theory.

Application of concentration of measure in quantum information theory

In the context of quantum information and the theory of entanglement typical spaces where measure concentration is studied are the set of all pure states $\mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ (identified with the complex projective space $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H})$) and the set consisting of$k$ dimensional (complex) subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$ (identified with complex Grassmanians $Gr_k(\mathcal{H})$) [141]. In both cases natural measures coming from the Haar measure on $U(\mathcal{H})$ are considered. Statistical ensembles obtained in this way describe the "uniform distribution" of pure states of a quantum system or, respectively, the "uniform distribution" of k-dimensional subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$. The most fundamental work in this context is [141]. In this paper concentration of measure theory is used to show, among other things, that in the case of a system consisting of two subsystems, $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$, "random" states and all states belonging to a "random" k-dimensional subspace $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathbb{C}^{d_1} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_2}$ are (for large enough k) typically maximally entangled. Another important application of the ideas of measure concentration is the Hastings counterexample of the minimal output entropy conjecture. In [142] it was shown that the minimal output entropy[2] $H^{\min}(\Lambda)$ is not additive, i.e. there exist quantum channels $\Lambda_1 \in \mathcal{CP}_0(\mathcal{H}_1)$, $\Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{CP}_0(\mathcal{H}_2)$ such that

$$H^{\min}(\Lambda_1 \otimes \Lambda_2) < H^{\min}(\Lambda_1) + H^{\min}(\Lambda_2)\ .$$

It is perhaps worth mentioning that tools of measure concentration are also used extensively in classical information theory (for instance in proofs of Shannon coding theorems [49]).

[2] The minimal output entropy $H^{\min}(\Lambda)$ is defined by $H^{\min}(\Lambda) = \min_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})} H(\Lambda[\rho])$, where where $H(\cdot)$ denotes the von-Neumann entropy of a quantum state.

Another important direction of research, closely related the results presented in next section, are studies of typical properties of entanglement with respect to a suitable probability measure (ensemble of states) on the space of mixed states $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_d)$ of a given system of distinguishable particles. In the two pioneering works [137, 138] authors showed, among other things that there exist a ball (with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt norm) around the maximally mixed state $\frac{\mathbb{I}}{N} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_d)$ consisting solely of separable states and estimated (numerically and analytically) in some cases fractions (calculated with respect to suitable natural measures on $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_d)$) of entangled and respectively separable states in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_d)$.

This line of research was then taken up in many works. Let us just mention two notable examples. In [140] the authors considered the measure μ_s on the set of bipartite states $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ steaming from the uniform ensemble of pure states $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^s\right)$ traced over the "environment" register $\mathbb{C}^s$. It turns out that in the limit $d \to \infty$ there exist a threshold dimension s_0 such that whenever $s < s_0$ the states are typically entangled and if $s > s_0$ they are typically separable (the analogous threshold exist for the NPPT property). Another interesting study [139] investigates the fraction of k-entangled[3] states in $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ with respect to the measure on $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ induced by the Hilbert-Schmidt distance.

Technical aspects of concentration of measure

We will now introduce the concept of Gaussian concentration formally. At the end of this part, in Fact 6.3, we state large deviation inequalities valid for the special unitary group $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$. These inequalities will be our main technical tool in the next section.

Definition 6.1. We will now Let (X, d) be a compact metric space equipped with a compatible structure of the probabilistic space (X, Σ, μ). Let $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function with the mean $\mathbb{E}_\mu f = \int_X f(x)\, d\mu(x)$ and the Lipschitz constant L. We say that on the space X we have the Gaussian concentration if for each Lipschitz f we have,

$$\mu\left(\{x \in X \,|\, f(x) - \mathbb{E}_\mu f \geq \epsilon\}\right) \leq C \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c\epsilon^2}{L^2}\right), \tag{6.3}$$

$$\mu\left(\{x \in X \,|\, |\, f(x) - \mathbb{E}_\mu f \leq -\epsilon\}\right) \leq C \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c\epsilon^2}{L^2}\right), \tag{6.4}$$

for arbitrary $\epsilon \geq 0$ and some positive constants $c, C > 0$.

The smaller the expressions (for fixed ϵ) on the right hand side and (6.3), the more robust the concentration phenomenon on X. The phenomenon of Gaussian measure concentration automatically occurs on compact Riemannian manifolds and controlled by their geometry (c.f. Subsection 2.3.2 for introduction of Riemannian geometry). Let $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ be a compact and connected Riemannian manifold with the metric tensor g normalized in such a way that the measure μ it induces is probabilistic (see Eq.(2.25)). On the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ we have also the Ricci curvature tensor[4] $\mathcal{R}$ compatible with the unique Levi-Civita connection on $\mathcal{M}$. Assume that $\mathcal{M}$ has a positive Ricci curvature and let

$$c = \min_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \min_{\substack{v \in T_p\mathcal{M} \\ g(v,v)=1}} \mathcal{R}(v, v). \tag{6.5}$$

The following fact guarantees that for a Riemannian manifold $\mathcal{M}$ with positive Ricci curvature we automatically have the Gaussian concentration.

[3] For the definition of k-entangled states see Subsection 5.2.2

[4] A Ricci tensor $\mathcal{R}$ is a symmetric tensor of type $(0, 2)$ that can be defined with the use of Levi-Civita connection on $\mathcal{M}$. For the precise definition of $\mathcal{R}$ see [77].

Fact 6.1. *(Ledoux [143]) Let $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M})$ be a smooth function on $\mathcal{M}$ with a mean $\mathbb{E}_\mu f$. Let L be a Lipschitz constant[5]. of f. Assume that c from Eq.(6.5) is positive. Then, the following inequalities hold,*

$$\mu\left(\{x \in \mathcal{M} \,|\, f(x) - \mathbb{E}_\mu f \geq \epsilon\}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{c\epsilon^2}{2L^2}\right), \tag{6.6}$$

$$\mu\left(\{x \in \mathcal{M} \,|\, f(x) - \mathbb{E}_\mu f \leq -\epsilon\}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{c\epsilon^2}{2L^2}\right), \tag{6.7}$$

where $c > 0$ is given by Eq.(6.5).

In what follows we will make an extensive use of the concentration of measure phenomenon on the special unitary group $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$as we will be interested in large deviation bounds for functions defined on this group (see the next Section). It will be convention for us to use a metric tensor g_{HS} induced on $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ from the embedding of $SU(\mathcal{H})$ in the set of all linear operators, $End(\mathcal{H})$, equipped with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle A, B\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left(A^\dagger B\right)$. Let us write the formula for g_{HS} explicitly. Special unitary group is a Lie group and thus for every $U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$we have an isomorphism $T_U\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \approx \mathfrak{su}(\mathcal{H})$, where $\mathfrak{su}(\mathcal{H})$ is the Lie algebra of the group consisting of anti-Hermitian traceless operators on $\mathcal{H}$ (see Subsection 2.3.3). The linear isomorphism is given by the following mapping

$$\mathfrak{su}(\mathcal{H}) \ni X \to \hat{X} = \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \exp(tX)\, U \in T_U\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}). \tag{6.8}$$

Using the identification (6.8) and treating an operator $\hat{X} = \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \exp(tX)\, U = XU$ as an element of $End(\mathcal{H})$ we get

$$g_{\mathrm{HS}}\left(\hat{X}, \hat{Y}\right) = \langle XU, YU\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[XU\right]^\dagger YU\right) = -\mathrm{tr}\left(XY\right), \tag{6.9}$$

where we have used $X^\dagger = -X$, identity $UU^\dagger = \mathbb{I}$ and the cyclicality of the trace.

Fact 6.2. *(Gromov, [144]) Consider a special unitary group $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ equipped with the metric g_{HS}. The following equality holds*

$$\min_{U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})} \min_{\substack{v \in T_U\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \\ g_{\mathrm{HS}}(v,v) = 1}} \mathcal{R}(v, v) = \frac{N}{2}, \tag{6.10}$$

where $N = \dim\mathcal{H}$.

As the inner product g_{HS} induces on $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ the usual Haar measure μ we get the following concentration of measure inequality for smooth functions defined on the special unitary group.

Fact 6.3. *([144]) Consider a special unitary group $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ equipped with the Haar measure μ and the metric g_{HS}. Let $f : \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function on $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ with the mean $\mathbb{E}_\mu f$ and let*[6]

$$L = \sqrt{\max_{p \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})} g_{\mathrm{HS}}(\nabla f, \nabla f)} \tag{6.11}$$

[5] For smooth functions on $\mathcal{M}$ the Lipschitz constant is given by $L = \sqrt{\max_{p\in\mathcal{M}} g(\nabla f, \nabla f)}$.

[6] The gradient ∇f is also computed with respect to the metric g_{HS}.

be a Lipschitz constant of f. Then, the following concentration inequalities hold

$$\mu\left(\{U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \,|\, f(U) - \mathbb{E}_\mu f \geq \epsilon\}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{N\epsilon^2}{4L^2}\right), \tag{6.12}$$

$$\mu\left(\{U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \,|\, f(U) - \mathbb{E}_\mu f \leq -\epsilon\}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{N\epsilon^2}{4L^2}\right), \tag{6.13}$$

where $N = \dim\mathcal{H}$.

6.2. Typical properties of correlations on sets of isospectral density matrices

In this section we apply criteria for detection of correlations derived in Chapter 8.3 to study the fraction of correlated states, $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$, on the manifolds of isospectral density matrices $\Omega \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. We will study (just like in the rest of this thesis) the notion of correlations defined via the choice of the class of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{M})$: the set correlated states (with respect to the choice of $\mathcal{M}$) consists of states that do not belong to the convex hull $\mathcal{M}^c$ of the class of non-correlated pure states (see Figures 1.1 and 6.1). Moreover we will focus on the situation when $\mathcal{M}$ can be defined via a polynomial condition (see c.f. Chapters 3-5)

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \mathrm{tr}\left(A\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right]\right) = 0, \tag{6.14}$$

where $A \in \mathrm{Herm}_+\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$ and $A \leq \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{k,sym}}$. The section is structured as follows. First we discuss in more detail the structure of the manifold of isospectral density matrices $\Omega \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ and sketch the idea of our reasoning. Then, we give, with the use of bilinear criteria derived in Chapter 5, lower bounds for $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ for four topical classes of correlations considered in this thesis: entanglement, entanglement of bosons, "entanglement" of fermions, and "non-Gaussian" correlations in fermionic systems. In the last part of the section, using criteria derived in Section 5.2, we obtain lower bound for $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ for the general case when the class $\mathcal{M}$ is given by a general polynomial condition (6.14). We apply these bound to two classes of correlations: Genuine Multiparty Entanglement (see Subsections 3.3.1 and 5.2.1) and Schmidt number of bipartite mixed states (see Subsections 3.3.2 and 5.2.2).

6.2.1. Geometry of Ω and the reduction to the concentration of measure on $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$

Let us start with an observation that for each $\Omega_{(p_1,\ldots,p_N)}$ is actually an orbit[7] of the action of $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. The group of special unitary matrices $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ acts on $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ "from the left" via conjugation, i.e. for each $U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ we have a mapping

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \ni \rho \longrightarrow U.\rho = U\rho U^\dagger \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}). \tag{6.15}$$

which satisfies $U_1.(U_2.\rho) = U_1U_2.\rho$ for $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ and $U_1, U_2 \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$. The action (6.15) preserves each set of isospectral density matrices $\Omega_{(p_1,\ldots,p_N)}$. Moreover, the action of $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ on $\Omega_{(p_1,\ldots,p_N)}$ is transitive[8], i.e. given two states $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Omega_{(p_1,\ldots,p_N)}$ there exist a unitary operator

[7] In the language of differential geometry orbits of a Lie group are usually called homogenous spaces. For an introduction to the beautiful and rich theory of homogenous spaces see [83].

[8] This follows straightforwardly from the fact that every Hermitian matrix can be diagonalized via conjugation by a element of $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$. Permutation of the spectrum of the diagonal matrix can be also performed via conjugation with an element of $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$.

$\in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\rho_2 = U_0.\rho_1$. Let us assume that we have fixed the a particular $\Omega_{(p_1,...,p_N)} \equiv \Omega$. Let us take an arbitrary $\rho_0 \in \Omega$ and consider a mapping

$$\varphi_{\rho_0} : \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \Omega_{(p_1,...,p_N)},\ \varphi_{\rho_0}(U) = U.\rho_0 = U\rho_0 U^{\dagger}.$$

We define a (normalized) measure μ_Ω on Ω via the pullback, via the mapping φ_{ρ_0}, of the Haar measure μ. That is, for every Borel subset ()[9] $\mathcal{O} \subset \Omega$ we define its measure via

$$\mu_\Omega(\mathcal{O}) = \mu\left(\varphi_{\rho_0}^{-1}(\mathcal{O})\right). \tag{6.16}$$

The invariance properties of μ guarantee that the measure μ_Ω does not depend on the choice of ρ_0. The measure μ_Ω is invariant under the action of the unitary group, i.e.

$$\mu_\Omega(U.\mathcal{O}) = \mu_\Omega(O) \tag{6.17}$$

for every Borel subset[10] $\mathcal{O} \subset \Omega$. Therefore, one should think of μ_Ω as the "most uniform" measure on Ω (an analogue of a uniform measure on n dimensional sphere $\mathbb{S}^n$). Let us now introduce a stabilizer group

$$\mathrm{Stab}(\rho_0) = \left\{U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \,\middle|\, U\rho_0 U^{\dagger} = \rho_0\right\}.$$

Every smooth function[11] $f : \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ that is invariant under the action of $\mathrm{Stab}(\rho)$, i.e.

$$f(Uh) = f(U), \tag{6.18}$$

for all $h \in \mathrm{Stab}(\rho_0)$and $U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ can be mapped to a smooth function on Ω, defined in the following manner

$$\tilde{f} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R},\ \tilde{f}(\rho) = f\left(\varphi_{\rho_0}^{-1}(\rho)\right). \tag{6.19}$$

The above expression is well defined by virtue of (6.18). From the definition of the measure μ_Ω (see Eq.(6.16)) it follows that for a smooth function $f : \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (6.18) we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_\Omega}\tilde{f} = \mathbb{E}_{\mu} f \tag{6.20}$$

or in other words

$$\int_\Omega \tilde{f}(\rho)\, d\mu_\Omega(\rho) = \int_{\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})} f(U)\, d\mu(U).$$

Definition 6.2. Let Ω be a manifold of isospectral density matrices (with prescribed ordered spectrum) and let μ_Ω be a measure on Ω induced from the Haar measure on $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$. For a fixed class of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ the fraction of correlated states in Ω,$\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}} \in [0,1]$, is defined by

$$\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}} = \mu_\Omega\left(\{\rho \in \Omega \mid \rho \notin \mathcal{M}^c)\}\right). \tag{6.21}$$

Our strategy for finding the lower bound for $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ is the following.

1. For a given manifold of isospectral density matrices Ω pick $\rho_0 \in \Omega$ and construct, using criteria developed in Chapter 5, a function $f_\Omega : U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

[9] We consider on Ω the topology induced from the inclusion $\Omega \subset \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H})$, where the latter is treated as an Euclidean space (with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt distance). For the comprehensive introduction to measure theory see [58].

[10] In (6.17) we have used the notation $U.\mathcal{O} = \{U.\rho \mid \rho \in \Omega)\}$.

[11] We could have considered more general functions but in what follows we will make use only of the smooth ones.

a) f_Ω is Stab (ρ_0)-invariant (in a sense of Eq.(6.18));
b) the corresponding function $\tilde{f}_\Omega : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following property:

$$\tilde{f}_\Omega(\rho) > 0 \implies \rho \notin \mathcal{M}^c .$$

2. Integrate $\tilde{f}_\Omega$ over Ω with respect to the measure μ_Ω (which amounts to integrating f_Ω over SU $(\mathcal{H})$ with respect to the Haar measure).
3. If the obtained average $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_\Omega}\tilde{f}_\Omega$ is positive infer, using relation between μ_Ω and μ and concentration of measure on SU $(\mathcal{H})$, about typicality of $\rho \in \Omega$ that are correlated ($\rho \notin \mathcal{M}^c$).

The more detailed reasoning and specific forms of functions f_Ω will be given in proofs of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 which are the main results of this Chapter

6.2.2. Lower bound for $\eta_\Omega^{\text{corr}}$ from bilinear witnesses

In this part we apply the strategy outlined above to give a lower bound for $\eta_\Omega^{\text{corr}}$ provided there exist an operator $V \in \text{Herm}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})$ that can be used to witness correlations[12],

$$\text{tr}(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 V) > 0 \implies \rho_1 \text{ and } \rho_2 \text{ are correlated } (\rho_1, \rho_2 \notin \mathcal{M}^c) . \tag{6.22}$$

Note that we can assume without the loss of generality that $\|V\| \leq$ ‘1.

Before we state our main result we first present two auxiliary lemmas that will be needed in its proof.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $V \in \text{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}\right)$ be a Hermitian operator on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$ satisfying[13] $\|V\| \leq 1$ and let $\rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots, \rho_k \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. Consider a function $f : \text{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by*

$$f(U) = \text{tr}\left(\left[U^{\otimes k}\{\rho_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \rho_k\}\left(U^\dagger\right)^{\otimes k}\right] V\right) . \tag{6.23}$$

Then, the Lipschitz constant L of the function f, with respect to the metric tensor g_{HS}, satisfies $L \leq 2 \cdot k$.

Proof. The proof is presented in the Section 8.4 of the Appendix (see page 172). □

Lemma 6.2. *Let $V \in \text{Herm}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2})$ be a Hermitian operator on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}$ and let $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. Consider a function $f_{\rho_1,\rho_2} : \text{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by*

$$f_{\rho_1,\rho_2}(U) = \text{tr}\left(\left[U^{\otimes 2}\{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2\}\left(U^\dagger\right)^{\otimes 2}\right] V\right) . \tag{6.24}$$

The average of the function f, $\mathbb{E}_\mu f$, with respect to the normalized unitary measure on SU $(\mathcal{H})$ *is given by*

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu f_{\rho_1,\rho_2} = \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2} + \frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}\text{tr}(\rho_1\rho_2) , \tag{6.25}$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbb{P}^{\text{sym}}V)}{\dim(\mathbb{P}^{\text{sym}})} , \beta = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbb{P}^{a\text{sym}}V)}{\dim(\mathbb{P}^{a\text{sym}})} .$$

Proof. The proof is presented in Section 8.4 of the Appendix (see page 173). □

[12] See Lemma 5.1 for the necessary and sufficient conditions that V has to fulfill in order for (6.22) to be satisfied.

[13] For $A \in \text{End}(\mathcal{H})$ we define an operator norm [58] by $\|A\| = \max_{|\psi\rangle:\langle\psi|\psi\rangle=1} \|A|\psi\rangle\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ in the above expression denotes the usual norm on $\mathcal{H}$.

Corollary 6.1. *Let* $f_{\rho_1,\rho_2} : \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ *be defined as in Eq.*(6.24). *Assume that* $\alpha \geq 0$ *and* $\beta \leq 0$. *Then the following equality holds*

$$\max_{\rho_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})} \mathbb{E}_\mu f_{\rho_1,\rho_2} = \frac{\alpha+\beta}{2} + \frac{\alpha-\beta}{2} p_{max}(\rho_1) , \tag{6.26}$$

where $p_{max}(\rho_1)$ *is the maximal eigenvalue of the state* ρ_1.

Proof. By the virtue of (6.25) it suffices to compute $\max_{\rho_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})} \mathrm{tr}(\rho_1 \rho_2)$. Due to the linearity (and thus concavity) of a function $\rho \to \mathrm{tr}(\rho_1 \rho)$ the maximum is achieved for pure states. The equality $\max_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})|} \mathrm{tr}(\rho_1 |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = p_{max}(\rho_1)$ follows from the spectral decomposition of ρ_1. □

Our results are summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ *be a class of non-correlated pure states.* be defined by (5.6) and let $V \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2})$ satisfy (6.22) and $\|V\| \leq 1$. Define

$$\alpha = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} V)}{\dim(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}})} , \beta = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(\mathbb{P}^{a\mathrm{sym}} V)}{\dim(\mathbb{P}^{a\mathrm{sym}})} \tag{6.27}$$

and assume[14]: $\alpha > 0$, $\beta < 0$ and $\alpha + \beta < 0$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ be a fixed manifold of isospectral density matrices and let $p_{\max}(\Omega)$ be the maximal eigenvalue of states from Ω. Let

$$p_{max,\mathrm{cr}} = -\frac{\alpha+\beta}{\alpha-\beta} . \tag{6.28}$$

Assume $p_{\max}(\Omega) = p_{\max,\mathrm{cr}} + \delta$ ($\delta > 0$). We have the following lower bound[15] for the fraction of correlated states $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ in Ω,

$$\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}} = \mu_\Omega(\{\rho \in \Omega | \rho \notin \mathcal{M}^c\}) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{N\delta^2(\alpha-\beta)^2}{256}\right) . \tag{6.29}$$

Proof. The proof is a simple application of the strategy outlined in the previous section. We fix a manifold of isospectral density matrices Ω and $\rho_0 \in \Omega$. From the bilinear correlation witness $V \in \mathrm{Herm}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2})$ we construct a function $f_\Omega : \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$f_\Omega(U) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[U^{\otimes 2}\{\rho_0 \otimes |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|\}\left(U^\dagger\right)^{\otimes 2}\right] V\right) , \tag{6.30}$$

where $|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$ is the projector[16] onto some fixed eigenvector of ρ_0 with the maximal eigenvalue $p_{\max}$. One checks that the $f_\Omega(U)$ is $\mathrm{Stab}(\rho_0)$-invariant[17] and therefore can be used to define a function $\tilde{f}_\Omega : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ (see Eq.(6.19)). Due to the fact that V is a bilinear correlation witness the following inclusion of sets holds

$$\{\rho \in \Omega | \rho \notin \mathcal{M}^c\} \supset \left\{\rho \in \Omega | \tilde{f}_\Omega(\rho) > 0\right\} .$$

[14] Restrictions on the parameters α, β are not incidental. In fact, they are typically satisfied for a concrete bilinear correlation witness (see below).

[15] The formula in (6.29) is slightly different (in the scalar factor in the denominator of the exponent) form the analogous one given in [114]. The reason for that is a small mistake in [114]. Here we have corrected it.

[16] From the Corollary 6.1 it follows that for a given witness V the proposed form of the function f_Ω which is used is optimal in the class of functions having the form (6.24).

[17] The group $\mathrm{Stab}(\rho_0)$ consists of all operators in $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ that commute with ρ_0

Consequently, on the level of measures we have

$$\mu_{\Omega}\left(\{\rho\in\Omega|\,\rho\notin\mathcal{M}^{c}\}\right)\geq\mu_{\Omega}\left(\left\{\rho\in\Omega|\,\tilde{f}_{\Omega}\left(\rho\right)>0\right\}\right)\,. \tag{6.31}$$

Using the definition of the measure μ_{Ω} we get

$$\mu_{\Omega}\left(\left\{\rho\in\Omega|\,\tilde{f}\left(\rho\right)>0\right\}\right)=\mu\left(\{U\in\mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)|\,f_{\Omega}\left(\rho\right)>0\}\right)\,, \tag{6.32}$$

$$=\mu\left(\{U\in\mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)|\,f_{\Omega}\left(\rho\right)\geq0\}\right)\,, \tag{6.33}$$

where the second equality follows form the fact that for nontrivial[18] V we have

$$\mu\left(\{U\in\mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)|\,f_{\Omega}\left(\rho\right)=0\}\right)=0\,.$$

We obtain lower bound for the right hand side of (6.32) by assuming $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}f_{\Omega}\geq0$, and making use of the inequality (6.13) and the result of the Lemma 6.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\left(\{U\in\mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)|\,f_{\Omega}\left(\rho\right)\geq0\}\right)&=\mu\left(\{U\in\mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)|\,f_{\Omega}\left(\rho\right)-\mathbb{E}_{\mu}f_{\Omega}\geq-\mathbb{E}_{\mu}f_{\Omega}\}\right)\,,\\&\geq1-\exp\left(-\frac{N}{64}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mu}f_{\Omega}\right)^{2}\right)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{6.34}$$

We now use the Lemma (6.2) and by inserting the formula (6.26) to (6.34). The formula for $p_{max,\mathrm{cr}}$ stems from the condition $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}f_{\Omega}=0$. Combination of the resulting expression with (6.31) finishes the proof. □

Let us discuss the results the Theorem 6.1 and its proof.

- By the virtue of Eq.(6.29) we know that whenever we have a bilinear correlation witness V we can give a lower bound for $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}}$, the fraction of correlated states on a manifold of isospectral density matrices Ω, provided $p_{\max}\left(\Omega\right)>p_{\mathrm{cr}}\left(\Omega\right)=-\frac{\alpha+\beta}{\alpha-\beta}$. The graphical representation of (6.29) is given on Figure 6.2.

- The obtained result does not tell us anything about behavior of $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}}$ for $p_{\max}\left(\Omega\right)\leq p_{\mathrm{cr}}\left(\Omega\right)$. In particular for many classes of non-correlated states $\mathcal{M}\subset\mathcal{D}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$ the convex hull $\mathcal{M}^{c}$ contains a ball (with respect to, say, the Hilbert-Schmidt metric) around the maximally mixed states. Consequently we have $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}}$ for $p_{\max}$ sufficiently close to $\frac{1}{N}$. This phenomenon happens in general in the case of entanglement [137] and, more generally, for correlations defined via coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups [43]. Unfortunately with the use of presented methods we can only bound the radius of the ball of non-correlated states from above.
- One could, in principle, use instead of $|\psi_{0}\rangle\langle\psi_{0}|$ some other operator in Eq.(6.30). However, by the virtue of Corollary 6.1 (see also the proof of Theorem 6.1) the choice of $|\psi_{0}\rangle\langle\psi_{0}|$ gives optimal concentration inequalities[19]
- We would like to remark that the non-linearity of the correlation criterion (6.22) is essential in the proof of Theorem 6.1. Imagine we had tried the analogous reasoning for the criterion based on the linear criterion[20] $f\left(\rho\right)=\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho W\right)$. Then we would have $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}f=\frac{1}{\mathrm{N}}\mathrm{tr}\left(W\right)$.

[18] By a nontrivial V we mean V that do not commute with all operators of the form $U\otimes U$, where $U\in\mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$.

[19] Instead of $|\psi_{0}\rangle\langle\psi_{0}|$ we could have used a any state $\rho_{0}^{'}=\frac{f(\rho_{0})}{\mathcal{N}}$, where $f:[0,1]\rightarrow\mathbb{R}_{+}$ is any non-negative function the unit interval (applied, in the usual operator-theoretic sense, to ρ_{0}) and $\mathcal{N}$ is a normalization constant.

[20] In order to be consistent with the convention used throughout the thesis we assume that the following implication holds $\rho\in\mathcal{M}^{c}\Longrightarrow\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho W\right)\leq0$.



Figure 6.2. Illustration of the lower bound (6.29). On the horizontal axis we have a maximal eigenvalue, $p_{\max}(\Omega)$, of some one parameter family of isospectral density matrices. The red curve depicts a hypothetical "true" fraction of correlated states on Ω (as a function of $p_{\max}(\Omega)$). The blue curve denotes the lower bound given by (6.29). The saturation of the blue curve is achieved on the scale Δ, which is of the order $\frac{\alpha-\beta}{\sqrt{N}}$. For $p_{\max}(\Omega) \leq p_{\mathrm{cr}}(\Omega)$ our methods do not allow us to give nontrivial lower bounds for $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$.

In cases when correlations are defined via the choice of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M}$, we usually[21] have $\frac{\mathbb{I}}{N} \in \mathcal{M}^c$ and from the value expression $\frac{1}{N}\mathrm{tr}(W) = \mathrm{tr}\left(W\frac{\mathbb{I}}{N}\right) \leq 0$ we cannot infer about the typical correlation properties of states on Ω.

- Obtaining a different bound for the Lipschitz constant of $f(U)$ in Eq.6.23 (for instance in terms of the spectrum of states from Ω) can lead to improved large deviation inequalities and consequently better bounds for $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$.
- We expect to obtain better concentration inequalities when we use Ricci curvature estimates for the manifold of isospectral density matrices Ω [83].

We now apply (6.29) for four topical types of correlations: entanglement, entanglement of bosons, "entanglement of fermions" and "non-Gaussian" correlations in fermionic systems. In each case we will use bilinear witnesses derived in Section 5.1. All these witnesses have the following structure

$$V = A - c\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}, \tag{6.35}$$

where A is a projector onto some subspace of $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H})$, $c > 0$ and $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}$ is a projector onto $\bigwedge^2(\mathcal{H})$. Consequently, for witnesses of the form (6.35) we get

$$\alpha = X = \frac{\dim(\mathrm{Im}(A))}{\dim(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}})}, \ \beta = -c,$$

Formulas (6.28) and (6.29) take the simplified form. We get

$$p_{max,\mathrm{cr}} = \frac{c - X}{c + X}, \tag{6.36}$$

and

$$\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}} = \mu_\Omega(\{\rho \in \Omega |\, \rho \notin \mathcal{M}^c\}) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{N\delta^2(X+c)^2}{256}\right), \tag{6.37}$$

for $p_{\max}(\Omega) = p_{\max,\mathrm{cr}} + \delta(\delta > 0)$. We now give the values of the relevant parameters that describe each of four scenarios mentioned above.

[21] Strictly speaking $\frac{\mathbb{I}}{N} \in \mathcal{M}^c$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}$ contains projectors onto vectors spanning $\mathcal{H}$

Proposition 6.1. *Values of the parameters relevant for the estimate* (6.37) *for four classes of coherent states: separable states, separable bosonic states, Slater determinants and Fermionic Gaussian states are given in Table* (6.1).

Class of states $\mathcal{M}$	N	X	c
Separable states	d^L	$1-2^{1-L}\left(\frac{(d+1)^L}{d^L+1}\right)$	$\left(1-2^{1-L}\right)$
Separable bosonic states	$\binom{d+L-1}{L}$	$1-\frac{2\binom{d+2L-1}{2L}}{\binom{d+L-1}{L}\left(\binom{d+L-1}{L}+1\right)}$	$\left(1-2^{1-L}\right)$
Slater determinants	$\binom{d}{L}$	$1-\frac{2\binom{d}{L}}{\binom{d}{L}+1}\cdot\frac{d+1}{(L+1)(d+1-L)}$	$1-\frac{2}{L+1-\max\{0,2L-d\}}$
Fermionic Gaussian states	2^{d-1}	$1-\frac{\binom{2d}{d}}{\left(2^{d-1}+1\right)2^{d-1}}$	1

Table 6.1. Parameters that appear in the estimate (6.37) for four types of correlations.

The class of "Fermionic Gaussian states" from the above table consists[22] *of pure Gaussian states of parity one,* $\mathcal{M}_g^+$ *and the relevant Hilbert space is* $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$.

Proof. The proof is given in Section 8.4 of the Appendix (see page 174). □

The important thing to notice is that for the above described types of correlations $p_{\max,cr}\to 0$ with the increase of the relevant parameters characterizing the system (number of particles L, number of modes d). We now give the asymptotic of $N\cdot p_{\max,cr}$ (the quantity $\frac{1}{N}$ defines a natural "length scale" for the variable $p_{\max}$) for these types of correlations. We study two asymptotic limits. In the first one (see Table 6.2) we fix the number of modes d and go to infinity with the number of particles L. In the second limit[23] (see Table 6.3) we set the ratio $\frac{d}{L}=a$ and increase the number of modes d. The asymptotics presented in Tables 6.2 and 6.3 give information about the behavior of the ratio of $p_{\max,cr}$ to the "typical" value of $p_{\max}$ which is of the order of $\frac{1}{N}$.

Class of states $\mathcal{M}$	N	$N\cdot p_{\max,cr}$
Separable states	d^L	$\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{2}\right)^L$
Separable bosonic states	$\frac{L^{d-1}}{(d-1)!}$	$\frac{2^{L+d}}{L^d}$

Table 6.2. Asymptotic behavior of N and $N\cdot p_{\max,cr}$ in the limit $d=const$, $L\to\infty$.

The asymptotics presented in Tables 6.2 and 6.3 were obtained with the usage of the standard asymptotic properties of binomial coefficients and factorials [134]. In the specific example of L qbit system the presented approach allows to give the upper bound R_{up} for the radius R of

[22] From the discussion carried out in Section 4.2 and Subsection 5.3.5 it follows that all convex-Gaussian states in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ have a block structure with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)=\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\oplus\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^-\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ where $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^{\pm}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ denote the subspaces of the Fock space spanned by an even, and respectively, odd number of excitations. For this reason a fraction of convex-Gaussian states in any nontrivial Ω equals 0. Therefore, in order not to consider a trivial situation we consider states defined solely on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Fock}}^+\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$.

[23] In Table 6.3 we use the following notation. By $H:[0,1]\to\mathbb{R}_+$ we denote the binary entropy:

$$H(x)=-x\log(x)-(1-x)\log(1-x)\ .$$

The function $f:(0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}_+$ is given by

$$f(a)=\log(2)\,a+a\log(a)-2a\log(2a)-(1+a)\log(1+a)+(1+2a)\log(1+2a)\,.$$

Class of states $\mathcal{M}$	N	$N \cdot p_{\max,cr}$
Separable states	$d^{a\cdot d}$	$\exp(a) \cdot \left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{a\cdot d}$
Separable bosonic states	$\exp\left(d\,(1+a) \cdot H\left(\frac{a}{1+a}\right)\right)$	$\sqrt{\frac{1+a}{2(1+2a)}} \exp\left(f\,(a)\,d\right)$
Slater determinants for $a \leq \frac{1}{2}$	$\exp\left(d \cdot H\left(\frac{1}{a}\right)\right)$	$\frac{\exp\left(\mathrm{d}\cdot \mathrm{H}\left(\frac{1}{\mathrm{a}}\right)\right)}{d}$
Slater determinants for $\frac{1}{2} \leq a \leq 1$	$\exp\left(d \cdot H\left(\frac{1}{a}\right)\right)$	$\frac{\exp\left(\mathrm{d}\cdot \mathrm{H}\left(\frac{1}{\mathrm{a}}\right)\right)}{a\cdot d}$
Fermionic Gaussian states	2^{d-1}	$2\frac{2^d}{\sqrt{\pi d}}$

Table 6.3. Asymptotic behavior of N and $N \cdot p_{\max,cr}$ in the limit: $\frac{L}{d} = a > 0$, $d \to \infty$.

the ball of separable states around the maximally mixed state. Using the results presented in Table 6.2 and the inequality $p_{\max} \leq \operatorname{tr}(\rho^2)$ we get $R_{up} \approx \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^L$. This result is much weaker than the known [145, 146] scaling $R \approx \alpha \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\right)^L$, for $\alpha = O(1)$, which is known in this case. We believe that it would be possible to obtain much smaller values of $p_{\max,cr}$ than the ones presented above if, instead of criteria (6.35) we use the general bilinear group-invariant criteria derived in Section 5.3.

6.2.3. Lower bound for $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ from k-linear witnesses

In this part we apply the strategy presented at the end of Subsection 6.2.1 to give a lower bound for $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ provided there exist an operator $A \in \mathrm{Herm}_+\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$ defining the class of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M}$. After presenting our general result we apply it to estimate $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ for the cases when the set of correlated states consist of Genuine multiparty entanglement in tripartite system and Schmidt number of bipartite states.

We first present the auxiliary results.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $V \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}\right)$ be a Hermitian operator on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$ given by*

$$V = A - (k-1)\left(\mathbb{I}^{\otimes k} - \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,k}}\right), \tag{6.38}$$

where $A \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$. Consider a function $f : \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(U) = \operatorname{tr}\left(\left[U^{\otimes k}\left\{\rho \otimes \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right)^{\otimes(k-1)}\right\}\left(U^\dagger\right)^{\otimes k}\right] V\right). \tag{6.39}$$

where $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ and $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$. The average of the function f, $\mathbb{E}_\mu f$, with respect to the normalized unitary measure on $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu f = -(k-1) + \left((k-1) + \frac{\operatorname{tr}(A)}{\dim\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)}\right) \operatorname{tr}\left(\left[\rho \otimes \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right)^{\otimes(k-1)}\right] \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,k}}\right). \tag{6.40}$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Lemma 6.2 and is given in Section 8.4 of the Appendix (see page 173). □

Corollary 6.2. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ and $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ be a projector onto a eigenvector of ρ corresponding to its maximal eigenvalue, denoted by $p_{\max}$. The expectation value of a function* (6.39) *is given by*

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu f = -(k-1) + \left((k-1) + \frac{\operatorname{tr}(A)}{\dim\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)}\right)\left(\frac{k-1}{k} p_{\max} - \frac{1}{k}\right). \tag{6.41}$$

Our main results are summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.2. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ *be a class of non-correlated pure states specified by a k-linear condition*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \mathrm{tr}\left(A\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right]\right) = 0\,,$$

where $A \in \mathrm{Herm}_+\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$, $\|A\| \leq 1$. Let us set

$$X = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(A)}{\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{k,sym}}\right)},\ \tilde{X} = \frac{1}{k-1}\frac{\mathrm{tr}(A)}{\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{k,sym}}\right)} \tag{6.42}$$

Let $\Omega \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ be a fixed manifold of isospectral density matrices and let $p_{\max}(\Omega)$ be the maximal eigenvalue of states from Ω. Let

$$p_{max,\mathrm{cr}} = \frac{k-1-\tilde{X}}{k-1+X}\,. \tag{6.43}$$

Assume $p_{\max} = p_{\max,\mathrm{cr}} + \delta$ $(\delta > 0)$. We have the following lower bound for the fraction of correlated states $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ in Ω

$$\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}} = \mu_\Omega\left(\{\rho \in \Omega |\, \rho \notin \mathcal{M}^c\}\right) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{N\delta^2 C_k (1+X)^2}{16}\right), \tag{6.44}$$

where $C_k = \left(\frac{k-1}{k}\right)^4$.

Proof. The proof is completely analogous to the proof of Theorem (6.1). The only difference is that instead of the function f_Ω given by (6.30) we use now

$$f_\Omega(U) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[U^{\otimes k}\left\{\rho \otimes \left(|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|\right)^{\otimes(k-1)}\right\}\left(U^\dagger\right)^{\otimes k}\right] V\right),$$

where $|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$ is the projector onto some fixed eigenvector of ρ_0 with the maximal eigenvalue $p_{\max}$. In order to compute $\mathbb{E}_\mu f_\Omega$ we use Lemma 6.3 and Corollary 6.2. the precise form of $p_{max,\mathrm{cr}}$ in Eq.(6.43) follows directly from application of (6.41). □

The discussion of Theorem 6.1 applies also to this result. We would like to remark that the criterion given by operator V of the form (6.38) is not particularly strong. Consequently, the obtained value of $p_{max,\mathrm{cr}}$ is certainly much overestimated. In the future we would like to develop better correlation witnesses that in turn would lead to better estimates for $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$.

We now apply (6.44) for for correlations describing a "refined" entanglement:

- Tripartite states exhibiting genuine multiparty entanglement (GME) in $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$;
- States in $\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ characterized by Schmidt number greater than some natural number n $(n \leq d-1)$.

In the case of tripartite GME the relevant class of non-correlated-states consists of 2-separable states $\mathcal{M}_d^2 \subset \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ (see Definition 3.1). In the case of correlations defined via Schmidt number the class of non-correlated states consists of bipartite states $\mathcal{M}_n \subset \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ with Schmidt rank bounded by $n \leq d-1$ (see Definition 3.2). The operators A defining (via Eq.(6.14)) classes $\mathcal{M}_d^2$ and $\mathcal{M}_n$ are given by Eq.(3.80) and (3.87) respectively. We now give the values of the relevant parameters appearing in (6.42) and (6.44) for both scenarios mentioned above.

Class of states $\mathcal{M}$	N	k	X
$\mathcal{M}_d^2$	d^3	6	$X = \frac{1}{8} + O\left(\frac{1}{d}\right)$
$\mathcal{M}_n$	d^2	$n+1$	$\frac{\binom{d}{n+1}^2}{\binom{d^2+n}{n+1}}$

Table 6.4. Parameters that appear in the estimate 6.44 for cases when correlated states consist of (i) tripartite states that exhibit GME (the relevant class of pure states is $\mathcal{M}_d^2$) and (ii) bipartite states that have Schmidt number greater than n, $n \leq d-1$ (the relevant class of pure states is $\mathcal{M}_n$).

Proposition 6.2. *Values of the parameters relevant for the estimate* (6.37) *for classes of non-correlated pure states* $\mathcal{M}_d^3 \subset \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ *and* $\mathcal{M}_n \subset \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ *are given in Table* (6.4).

In the case of $\mathcal{M}_d^3$ *we were not able to compute* $X = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(A)}{\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{k,sym}}\right)}$ *explicitly. Instead we gave the asymptotic expression*[24].

Proof. The sketch of proof is given in Section 8.4 of the Appendix (see page 174). □

6.3. Summary and open problems

In this Chapter we studied the fraction of correlated states, $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$, on manifolds of isospectral density matrices $\Omega \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$. The results presented in this chapter are generalization of the results from one of the article of the author [114]. We obtained the connection between $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ and the polynomial description of the class of pure non-correlated states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$. More precisely, we derived lower bounds to $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ in terms of the quantities characterizing operator $A \in \mathrm{Herm}_+\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$ used to define the class $\mathcal{M}$ (via Eq.(6.14)). In short we showed that whenever states belonging to Ω are "pure enough" and if the dimension of the relevant Hilbert space is "large" (for more quantitative statements see Theorems 6.1 and 6.2) the fraction of correlated states $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ is very close to unity. In order to obtain these results we used the technique of measure concentration (introduced in Section 6.1) and multilinear criteria for detection of correlations derived in Chapter 5. We applied our general results to particular types of correlations:

- Entanglement, particle entanglement of bosons, "entanglement of fermions", "non-Gaussianity" fermionic states (see Proposition 6.1 and Tables 6.2 and 6.3);
- Genuine multipartite entanglement of tripartite system and the notion of correlations based on Schmidt rank (see Proposition 6.2 and Table 6.4).

For each type of correlations we expressed $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ via the relevant parameters characterizing a given scenario (number of particles, number of modes etc.). To our knowledge studies of the fraction of correlated states on the manifolds of isospectral density matrices have not been carried out before the work presented here (and in [114]).

Open problems

Below we give a list of interesting open problems related to the work presented in this Chapter.

[24] We used the standard "big O" notation: for a function of a real parameter d we write $f(d) = O\left(\frac{1}{d}\right)$ if and only if $\lim_{d\to\infty} |f(d)| \cdot d < \infty$

- Apply the obtained results for $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}}$ to study the fraction of correlated states, η^{corr}on the set off all states $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$ but equipped with some $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$-invariant measure (e.g., Hilbert-Schmidt measure [147] or Bures measure [148]);
- Find the maximal radius of a ball (with respect to Hilbert-Schmidt distance) that is contained in $\mathcal{M}^c \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, where the class of pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is defined by the condition $\mathrm{tr}\left(A\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right]\right) = 0$;
- For a given class $\mathcal{M}$ defined as above give ranges of (ordered) spectra $(p_1, \ldots, p_N)$ such that $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}} \approx 1$ and $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}} \approx 0$ respectively.
- Assume that $P(\Omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i^2 > 1 - \epsilon$, where $\epsilon > 0$ can be chosen to be arbitrary small. Do non-correlated states in Ω have the full measure? In other words do we have $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}} < 1$ whenever ϵ is nonzero?
- Let $A \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$ be the operator defining the class of non-correlated states $\mathcal{M}$. The problem of estimating $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}}$ on the manifold of isospectral density matrices Ω is invariant under the conjugation of A under "global unitaries",

$$A \to U.A = A' = U^{\otimes k} A \left(U^{\otimes k}\right)^{\dagger}, \tag{6.45}$$

where $U \in \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}}$ should depend only on the orbit the group $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ through the operator $A \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$. This orbit is uniquely characterized by the polynomial invariants [86] of the action (6.45) of $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ in $\mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k(\mathcal{H})\right)$. It would be interesting to know which polynomial invariants determine the behavior of $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}}$ (for a fixed Ω). Note that the reasoning presented in this Chapter estimates $\eta_{\Omega}^{\mathrm{corr}}$ based solely on the perhaps simplest invariant of the action (6.45), the trace of the operator A.

7. Summary and outlook

In this thesis we analyzed various properties of correlations which are defined in the analogous manner to entanglement. The starting point was always the class of non-correlated pure states $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ of the Hilbert space of interest. The set of non-correlated mixed states consisted of states belonging to the convex hull, $\mathcal{M}^c \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$, of the set $\mathcal{M}$. The correlated states (with respect to the choice of the class $\mathcal{M}$) were then defined as states that do not belong to $\mathcal{M}^c$. Throughout the thesis we analyzed cases when non-correlated pure states are defined as a zero set of a homogenous polynomial in the density matrix,

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M} \iff \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes k}\right] A\right) = 0\,, \tag{7.1}$$

where A is the non-negative operator on the k-fold symmetrization of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Bellow we list the main results presented in this thesis.

Chapter 3

In this chapter we presented a polynomial characterization of many classes of pure states that define a physically-relevant types of correlations. The main results contained in the chapter are:

- Characterization of coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups as zero sets of a polynomial (in state's density matrix) of degree 2 (Proposition 3.2).
- Explicit forms of the polynomial of degree two characterizing the following classes of pure states in finite dimensional Hilbert spaces:
  — Pure separable states (Lemma 3.1);
  — Separable bosonic states (Lemma 3.2);
  — Slater determinants (Lemma 3.3);
  — Fermionic Gaussian states (Proposition 3.4).
  These are examples of classes of states that can be interpreted as the coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups.
- Explicit forms of the polynomial of degree two characterizing pure separable states (Lemma 3.4), bosonic separable states (Lemma 3.5) and Slater determinants (Lemma 3.6) in situations where single particle Hilbert spaces are general separable Hilbert spaces.
- A polynomial characterization of the multiparty pure states that do not exhibit Genuine Multiparty Entanglement (Lemma 3.7).
- A polynomial characterization of the bipartite pure states with bounded Schmidt rank (Lemma 3.8).
- Characterization of coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups as a zero set of a polynomial of degree k (Lemma 3.9).

Chapter 4

In this part of the thesis we investigated the cases when the polynomial characterization of pure non-correlated states (7.1) allows to analytically characterize the set of mixed correlated states $\mathcal{M}^c$. The main results of the chapter are:

- Group-theoretic characterization of generalized coherent states that can be defined via the anti-unitary conjugation (Theorems 4.1 and 4.2). For the correlations defined via this kind of coherent states it is possible to characterize the class of correlated mixed states via a simple analytical condition based on Uhlmann-Wotters construction (Eq.4.11).
- Analytical characterization of fermionic convex-Gaussian states in four mode fermionic Fock space (Theorem 4.3).
- A generalized Schmidt decomposition for pure states in even/odd subspace of Four mode Fock space (Lemma 4.1).

Chapter 5

I this chapter we used the characterization (7.1) of the set $\mathcal{M}$ to derive a nonlinear criteria for detection of correlations in general mixed states. The most important results of the chapter are:

- Derivation of the polynomial criterion detecting correlations in mixed states based solely on the polynomial characterization (7.1) of pure uncorrelated states for $k = 2$ (Theorem 5.1) and for arbitrary number k (Theorem 5.2). We derived, using results from Chapter 3 correlation criteria for seemingly unrelated types of correlations:
  — Entanglement of distinguishable particles;
  — Particle entanglement of bosons;
  — "Entanglement" of fermions;
  — Non-convex Gaussian correlations in fermionic systems;
  — Genuine multipartite entanglement;
  — Correlations based on the notion of Schmidt number.
- Complete description of group-invariant bilinear correlation witnesses for correlations based on coherent states of compact simply-connected Lie groups[1] (Theorem 5.3). The general method was applied to four classes of coherent sates: separable states (Lemma 5.6), separable bosonic states (Lemma 5.9), Slater determinants (Lemma 5.12) and fermionic Gaussian states (Lemma 5.15).

Chapter 6

In this chapter we studied the fraction of correlated states $\eta_\Omega^{\text{corr}}$ on manifolds of isospectral density matrices $\Omega \subset \mathcal{D}_1(\mathcal{H})$ of a relevant Hilbert space. We used the nonlinear criteria for detection of correlations to find lower bounds for $\eta_\Omega^{\text{corr}}$ for correlations defined via the Eq.(7.1). The main original contributions contained in the chapter are:

- Estimation from bellow of the fraction of correlated states $\eta_\Omega^{\text{corr}}$ on the manifold of isospectral density matrices. The estimate is given in terms of the spectrum of states from Ω and the trace of the operator A from (7.1) (see Theorem 6.1 for $k = 2$ and Theorem 6.2 for arbitrary k).
- Application of the above estimate for concrete types of correlations:
  — Entanglement of distinguishable particles, particle entanglement of Bosons, "entanglement" of fermions, not convex-Gaussian correlations in fermionic systems (Proposition 6.1);
  — Genuine multiparty entanglement, States with Schmidt number greater than n (Proposition 6.2).

[1] In order for the description to be effective we need to add some additional assumptions (see Subsection 5.3.1).

Open problems

The lists of open problems related to results obtained in the thesis were given at the end of each of the Chapters 3- 6. Bellow we list the problems which are in our opinion most important.

- Is it possible to find a polynomial characterization for optical coherent states, squeezed states, and bosonic Gaussian and optical coherent states? These classes of states and the corresponding types of correlations are relevant in the field of quantum optics [19]. These families of states can be also interpreted as coherent states of suitably-chosen groups represented on the bosonic Fock space. These groups however are not compact and the representations in question are infinite-dimensional. For this reason the methods used in this thesis cannot be directly applied. It would be also interesting to derive for these classes the "bilinear correlation witnesses" in a way analogous to the considerations presented in Section 5.3.
- Derive, using ideas of quantum de-Finetti theorem [108] a complete hierarchy of criteria characterizing convex hulls of classes of states $\mathcal{M}$ given by Eq.(7.1).
- Derive a complete characterization of mixed states (for any number of particles and for arbitrary dimensions of single-particle Hilbert spaces) via invariant polynomials of the group of local unitary operations.
- Develop a full resource theory (analogous to the one existing in the context of entanglement [3] or ancilla-assisted Clifford computation [131]) for the ancilla-assisted FLO or TQC.
- The operator $A \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k\left(\mathcal{H}\right)\right)$ from Eq.(7.1). describes the properties of the convex hull $\mathcal{M}^c$ completely. However, the value of $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ is invariant under the conjugation of A under "global unitaries",

$$A \to U.A = A' = U^{\otimes k} A \left(U^{\otimes k}\right)^\dagger , \tag{7.2}$$

  where $U \in \mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$. Therefore, $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ should depend only on the orbit of $\mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$ through the operator $A \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k\left(\mathcal{H}\right)\right)$. It is now natural to ask which polynomial invariants (of the action 7.2) determine the behavior of $\eta_\Omega^{\mathrm{corr}}$ (for a fixed Ω).

8. Appendix

A number of results presented in Chapters 3-6 were stated without proofs. In this chapter we give full or sketched proofs of these results. The chapter is decided into four sections, each corresponding to one of the chapters listed above. Section are divided into parts, each containing a proof of a single result. We did not restate the results whose proofs we are presenting. The same concerns the notation used in the proofs - it is assumed that the reader is familiar with the notation used to state a given result.

8.1. Proofs of results stated in Chapter 3

Proof of Lemma 3.3

Proof of Lemma 3.3. We prove that $\mathbb{P}_f : \bigotimes^{2L} \mathcal{H} \to \bigotimes^{2L} \mathcal{H}$ defined by

$$\mathbb{P}_f = \alpha \left(\mathbb{P}^+_{11'} \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{22'} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbb{P}^+_{LL'} \right) \left(\mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}} \right)$$

is precisely $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$. One possible proof relies on the representation theory of SU(N). Main technical tools involved are Young diagrams, Schur-Weyl duality and the theory of plethysms [84, 85]. We present a simpler reasoning based on two simple facts

- *Fact 1.* The operator $\mathbb{P}_f$ is the projector onto some irreducible representation of SU(N) in $\bigotimes^{2L} \mathcal{H}$.
- *Fact 2.* $\mathbb{P}_f \left(|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \right) = |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle$, where $|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \wedge |\psi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_L\rangle$ is the highest weight vector of the representation $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$.

Fact 1 follows from the structure of irreducible representations of SU (N) in $\bigotimes^{2L} \mathcal{H}$ (See Subsection 2.4.3). Before we prove Fact 2 let us assume for the moment that above two facts are true. Because $\mathbb{P}_f$ preserves $|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle$ and from the vector $|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle$ it is possible to generate (via the action of SU(N)) the whole $\mathcal{H}^{2\lambda_0} \subset \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) \otimes \bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H}) \subset \bigotimes^{2L} \mathcal{H}$, one concludes that $\mathbb{P}_f = \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$. Let us now prove the second fact. We fix the basis $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{i=N}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ and we set let $|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \wedge |\psi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_L\rangle$ be the normalized highest weight vector of the representation $\bigwedge^L (\mathcal{H})$. From the definition of the wedge product we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_f \left(|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \right) = \mathbb{P}_f \left(|\psi_1\rangle \wedge |\psi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_L\rangle \otimes |\psi_1\rangle \wedge |\psi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_L\rangle \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_f \left(\sum_{\sigma \in S_L} \sum_{\tau \in S_L} \text{sgn}\,(\sigma)\text{sgn}\,(\tau)\, |\psi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\sigma(2)}\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |\psi_{\sigma(L)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\tau(1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\tau(2)}\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |\psi_{\tau(L)}\rangle \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{\sigma \in S_L} \sum_{\tau \in S_L} \text{sgn}\,(\sigma\tau) \left(|\psi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\tau(1)}\rangle + |\psi_{\tau(1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \right) \otimes \ldots \otimes \left(|\psi_{\sigma(L)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\tau(L)}\rangle + |\psi_{\tau(L)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\sigma(L)}\rangle \right) . \qquad (8.1)
\end{aligned}$$

In the above expressions, S_L denotes permutation group of L elements and sgn $(\cdot)$ denotes the sign of a permutation. In order to simply the notation, we swapped order of terms in the full tensor product $\bigotimes^{2L} \mathcal{H}$, i.e. we used the isomorphism:

$$\bigotimes^{2L} \mathcal{H} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{i=L} \mathcal{H}_i \right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i=1'}^{i=L'} \mathcal{H}_i \right) \approx (\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_{1'}) \otimes (\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_{2'}) \otimes \ldots \otimes (\mathcal{H}_L \otimes \mathcal{H}_{L'}) ,$$

for $\mathcal{H}_i \approx \mathcal{H}$. Let us introduce the notation

$$|\Phi_{k,\sigma,\theta}\rangle = (|\psi_{\tau(1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle) \otimes \ldots \otimes (|\psi_{\tau(k)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\sigma(k)}\rangle) \otimes (|\psi_{\sigma(k+1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\tau(k+1)}\rangle) \otimes \ldots \otimes (|\psi_{\sigma(L)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\tau(L)}\rangle) +$$
$$+ (|\psi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\tau(1)}\rangle) \otimes (|\psi_{\tau(2)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\sigma(2)}\rangle) \otimes \ldots \otimes (|\psi_{\tau(k+1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\sigma(k+1)}\rangle) \otimes (|\psi_{\sigma(k+2)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\tau(k+2)}\rangle) \otimes \ldots + \ldots ,$$

where $\ldots$ denotes the summation over the remaining $\binom{L}{k} - 2$ terms. One obtains by the different choice of k element combinations from $\{1, \ldots, L\}$. Reordering of terms in (8.1) gives

$$\frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{k=0}^{k=L} \left(\sum_{\sigma \in S_L} \sum_{\tau \in S_L} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma\tau) |\Phi_{k,\sigma,\theta}\rangle \right) . \tag{8.2}$$

The operator $\mathbb{P}_f$ preserves $\bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \bigwedge^L(\mathcal{H})$ and therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}_f (|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle) = \left(\mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}} \right) \circ \mathbb{P}_f (|\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle) .$$

As a result from (8.2) we have

$$\frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{k=0}^{k=L} \left(\sum_{\sigma \in S_L} \sum_{\tau \in S_L} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma\tau) \left(\mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}} \right) |\Phi_{k,\sigma,\theta}\rangle \right) . \tag{8.3}$$

We claim that for each $k = 0, \ldots L$ we have

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_L} \sum_{\tau \in S_L} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma\tau) \left(\mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}} \right) (|\Phi_{k,\sigma,\theta}\rangle) = |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle . \tag{8.4}$$

Indeed, application of $\mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\text{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}$ gives

$$\frac{1}{(L!)^2} \sum_{\sigma \in S_L} \sum_{\tau \in S_L} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma\tau) \left(\left(|\psi_{\tau(1)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\tau(2)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_{\tau(k)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(k+1)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \right) \otimes \right. \tag{8.5}$$
$$\left. \otimes \ldots \otimes \left(|\psi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(2)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(k)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\tau(k+1)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \right) + \ldots \right) ,$$

where $\ldots$ denotes the summation over remaining $\binom{L}{k} - 1$ terms. Let $S_L(\sigma, k)$ denote the subgroup of S_L consisting of permutations that do not mix sets

$$\{\sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(k)\} \text{ and } \{\sigma(k+1), \ldots, \sigma(L)\} .$$

We have $S_L(\sigma, k) \approx S_k \times S_{L-k}$. As a result, for the fixed $\sigma \in S_k$ we have

$$\sum_{\tau \in S_L} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma\tau) \left(|\psi_{\tau(1)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\tau(2)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_{\tau(k)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(k+1)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \right) \otimes \left(|\psi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(2)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(k)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\tau(k+1)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \right)$$

$$= \sum_{\tau \in S_L(\sigma,k)} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma\tau) \operatorname{sgn}\left(\tau\sigma^{-1}\right) \left(|\psi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(2)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(L)}\rangle \right) \otimes \left(|\psi_{\sigma(1)}\rangle \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(2)}\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\psi_{\sigma(L)}\rangle \right) = (L-k)! \cdot k! |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle .$$

Treating all other terms in the outer bracket of (8.5) in the similar fashion gives

$$\frac{1}{(L!)^2} \left(\sum_{\sigma \in S_L} \binom{L}{k} (L-k)! \cdot k! \right) |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle = |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\lambda_0}\rangle ,$$

which proves (8.4). From (8.4) and (8.2) we conclude the proof of the second Fact and therefore prove that $\mathbb{P}_f = \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda_0}$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.3

Proof. The proposition follows from the known characterization of fermionic Gaussian states [22]. Every Gaussian state $\rho \in \text{Gauss}$ can be put by the conjugation of $U \in \mathcal{B}$ to the following form.

$$\tilde{\rho} = U\rho U^\dagger = \frac{1}{2^d} \prod_{k=1}^{d} \left(\mathbb{I} + i\lambda_k c_{2k-1} c_{2k}\right) ,$$

where coefficients λ_k are eigenvalues of the matrix $[h_{kl}]$ from Eq.(3.44). Pure Gaussian states $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ are characterized by the condition $\lambda_i \in \{1, -1\}$. We now use the fact that the group $\mathcal{B}$ acts on the matrix $[h_{kl}]$ via the orthogonal conjugation by arbitrary element of $\text{SO}(2d)$. Consequently, for $\det([h_{kl}]) = 1$ we get that $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ can be transformed to the vacuum state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ and therefore $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_g^+$. Using the analogous reasoning for the pure Gaussian state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ for which $\det([h_{kl}]) = -1$ we get $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_g^-$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.4

Proof. Let us first note that Λ is a sum of $2d$ Hermitian and manually commuting operators $c_i \otimes c_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, 2d)$ having eigenvalues ± 1. The projector onto the (one-dimensional) common eigenspace of operators $\{c_i \otimes c_i\}_{i=1}^{i=2d}$ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_{\vec{\mu}} = \frac{1}{2^{2d}} \prod_{i=1}^{2d} \left(\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mu_i c_i \otimes c_i\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{2d} \sum_{\substack{X \subset \{1, \ldots, 2d\} \\ |X| = k}} \prod_{i \in X} \mu_i c_i \otimes c_i \,, \tag{8.6}$$

where integer vector $\vec{\mu}$ labels all possible collections of joint spectra of operators $\{c_i \otimes c_i\}_{i=1}^{i=2d}$, i.e.

$$\vec{\mu} = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{2d}) \ ,$$

with $\mu_i = \pm 1$. Consequently we have

$$\mathbb{P}_0 = \sum_{\vec{\mu},\, \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \mu_i = 0} \mathbb{P}_{\vec{\mu}} \,, \tag{8.7}$$

where the summation is over all integer $\vec{\mu}$ having entries $\mu_i = \pm 1$ and satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{2d} \mu_i = 0$. The combinatorial sum (8.7) is computed via the elegant method that uses integration over complex variables[1] which we now present. Recall the following elementary result from complex analysis, valid for arbitrary natural number n_1,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S_1} \frac{dz}{z^{n_1+1}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } n_1 = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} , \tag{8.8}$$

[1] We are grateful to Maciek Lisicki for recalling to the author this method of integration while discussing the solution to the problem of the "Kac ring"[149].

where $\int_{S_1} dz$ denotes the integration over the unit circle oriented anticlockwise. We have the following chain of equalities

$$\mathbb{P}_0 = \sum_{\vec{\mu},\, \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \mu_i = 0} \mathbb{P}_{\vec{\mu}}\,, \tag{8.9}$$

$$= \sum_{\vec{\mu}} \mathbb{P}_{\vec{\mu}} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S_1} \frac{dz}{z^{\sum_i \mu_1 + 1}}\,, \tag{8.10}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S_1} dz \sum_{\vec{\mu}} \frac{1}{z^{\sum_i \mu_1 + 1}} \mathbb{P}_{\vec{\mu}}\,, \tag{8.11}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S_1} dz \sum_{\vec{\mu}} \frac{1}{z^{\sum_i \mu_1 + 1}} \left(\frac{1}{2^{2d}} \sum_{k=0}^{2d} \sum_{\substack{X \subset \{1,\ldots,2d\} \\ |X| = k}} \prod_{i \in X} \mu_i c_i \otimes c_i \right)\,, \tag{8.12}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^{2d}} \sum_{k=0}^{2d} \sum_{\substack{X \subset \{1,\ldots,2d\} \\ |X| = k}} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S_1} dz \sum_{\vec{\mu}} \frac{\prod_{i \in X} \mu_i}{z^{\sum_i \mu_1 + 1}} \right) \prod_{i \in X} c_i \otimes c_i\,. \tag{8.13}$$

In (8.10) we have applied to (8.9) the identity (8.8). In the latter manipulations we changed a number of times the order of summation and respectively integration. In (8.12) we simply applied to (8.11) the binomial expansion of $\mathbb{P}_{\vec{\mu}}$ (see (8.6)). For a fixed $X \subset \{1,\ldots,2d\}$ the integral

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S_1} dz \sum_{\vec{\mu}} \frac{\prod_{i \in X} \mu_i}{z^{\sum_i \mu_1 + 1}}$$

depends only on the cardinality $|X| = k$ of the set X,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S_1} dz \sum_{\vec{\mu}} \frac{\prod_{i \in X} \mu_i}{z^{\sum_i \mu_1 + 1}} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S_1} \frac{dz}{z^{2d+1}} \left(1 - z^2\right)^k \left(1 + z^2\right)^{2d-k}\,.$$

By expanding the polynomial in the numerator of the above expression and using (8.8) we get

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{S_1} dz \sum_{\vec{\mu}} \frac{\prod_{i \in X} \mu_i}{z^{\sum_i \mu_1 + 1}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } |X| = k \,\text{odd} \\ (-1)^{\frac{k}{2}} \frac{k!(2d-k)!}{d!\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)!\left(d-\frac{k}{2}\right)!} & \text{for } |X| = k \,\text{even} \end{cases}\,. \tag{8.14}$$

Inserting (8.14) into (8.13) and introduction of a new variable $\tilde{k} = 2k$ gives precisely (3.52). □

Proof of Proposition 3.6

Proof. We prove Eq.(3.90) by direct computation. In what follows we will consequently use the isomorphism (3.86). Before we proceed, let us introduce an auxiliary notation $E_{i,j} = |i\rangle|i\rangle\langle j|\langle j|$. Using this notation we get

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \lambda_i \lambda_j E_{ij}\,.$$

Inserting the above formula to $\langle\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}|A_n|\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}\rangle$ we get

$$\sum_{i_1,j_1=1}^{d}\ldots\sum_{i_{n+1},j_{n+1}=1}^{d}\left(\prod_{k=1}^{n+1}\lambda_{i_k}\right)\left(\prod_{l=1}^{n+1}\lambda_{j_l}\right)\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[E_{i_1,,j_i}\otimes\ldots\otimes E_{i_{n+1},,j_{n+1}}\right]\mathbb{P}_A^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}}\otimes\mathbb{P}_B^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}}\right)\,. \tag{8.15}$$

From the definitions of E_{ij} and operator $\mathbb{P}_A^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}}\otimes\mathbb{P}_B^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}}$ we get

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[E_{i_1,j_i}\otimes\ldots\otimes E_{i_{n+1},j_{n+1}}\right]\mathbb{P}_A^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}}\otimes\mathbb{P}_B^{\mathrm{asym,n+1}}\right)=\frac{1}{\left[(n+1)!\right]^2}\delta_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_{n+1}\},\{j_1,\ldots,j_{n+1}\}}\delta_{|\{i_1,\ldots,i_{n+1}\}|,n+1}\,, \tag{8.16}$$

where

$$\delta_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_{n+1}\},\{j_1,\ldots,j_{n+1}\}}$$

is the Kronecker delta with arguments being subsets of the set $\{1,\ldots,d\}$. Applying (8.16) to (8.15) we get

$$\langle\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}|A_n|\psi^{\otimes(n+1)}\rangle=\frac{1}{\left[(n+1)!\right]^2}\sum_{\substack{X\subset\{1,\ldots,d\}\\|X|=n+1}}\left(\prod_{i\in X}\lambda_i^2\right)\cdot(n+1)!\,, \tag{8.17}$$

where the factor $(n+1)!$ on the right hand side of (8.17) comes from the fact that the conditions enforced by (8.16) are the following

- There is the equality of sets $\{i_1,\ldots,i_{n+1}\},\{j,\ldots,j_{n+1}\}$ (for fixed set $\{i_1,\ldots,i_{n+1}\}$ there is a freedom in permutation of elements of the sequence $(j_1,\ldots,j_{n+1})$.
- Both sets $\{i_1,\ldots,i_{n+1}\},\{j,\ldots,j_{n+1}\}$ must contain exactly $n+1$ elements.

Equation (8.17) is equivalent to (3.90). □

Proof of Lemma 3.9

Proof. Let us first notice that, by the virtue of Proposition (3.7) and Eq.(2.81) the we have the equivalence

$$\langle\psi^{\otimes k}|\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,k}}-\mathbb{P}^{k\lambda_0}\right)|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle=0\iff\langle\psi^{\otimes k}|L_k|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle=(k\lambda_0,\,k\lambda_0+2\delta)\,, \tag{8.18}$$

where $L_k:\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k}\to\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k}$ is the representation of the second order Casimir in $\left(\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}\right)^{\otimes k}$,

$$L_k=-\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left(\pi\left(X_i\right)\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}+\mathbb{I}\otimes\pi\left(X_i\right)\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-2)}+\ldots+\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}\otimes\pi\left(X_i\right)\right)^2\,, \tag{8.19}$$

where we used the same notation as in Eq.(3.8). Using the definition (8.19) we get

$$\langle\psi^{\otimes k}|L_k|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle=\langle\psi^{\otimes k-1}|L_{k-1}|\psi^{\otimes k-1}\rangle+2\left(k-1\right)\sum_{i=1}^{M}\langle\psi|\pi\left(X_i\right)|\psi\rangle^2+\langle\psi|\sum_{i=1}^{M}\pi\left(X_i\right)^2|\psi\rangle\,.$$

Using now induction over the natural number k we get

$$\langle\psi^{\otimes k}|L_k|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle=-k\left(k-1\right)\sum_{i=1}^{M}\langle\psi|\pi\left(X_i\right)|\psi\rangle^2-k\langle\psi|\sum_{i=1}^{M}\pi\left(X_i\right)^2|\psi\rangle \tag{8.20}$$

$$=-k\left(k-1\right)\sum_{i=1}^{M}\langle\psi|\pi\left(X_i\right)|\psi\rangle^2+k\left(\lambda_0,\,\lambda_0+2\delta\right)\,, \tag{8.21}$$

$$=\frac{k\left(k-1\right)}{2}\langle\psi^{\otimes2}|L_2|\psi^{\otimes2}\rangle+k\left(k-2\right)\left(\lambda_0,\,\lambda_0+2\delta\right)\,. \tag{8.22}$$

where in (8.21) we used the fact that $\mathcal{H}^{\lambda_0}$ is an irreducible representation of a Lie group K (or equivalently $\mathfrak{k} = \mathrm{Lie}\,(K)$ or $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$). In (8.22) we used (8.21) for $k = 2$. We conclude the proof by noting that by the virtue of Eq.(3.17) and (8.22) the maximum value of $\langle\psi^{\otimes k}|L_k|\psi^{\otimes k}\rangle$ (equal $(k\lambda_0,\, k\lambda_0 + 2\delta)$) is achieved for $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_0}$. □

8.2. Proofs of results stated in Chapter 4

Proof of Lemma 4.1

Let us note that in the considered setting we have an antiunitary conjugation θ_+ detecting correlations, as in Theorem 4.2. From the proof of this theorem (see Eq.(4.19)) we get, that every normalized vector $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^+_{\mathrm{Fock}}\,(\mathbb{C}^4)$ can be written, up to phase, as a combination

$$|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{1-a^2}|\psi_1\rangle + ia|\psi_2\rangle\,, \tag{8.23}$$

where $0 \leq a \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, and $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ are orthogonal states satisfying $\theta_+|\psi_\alpha\rangle = |\psi_\alpha\rangle$, $\alpha = 1, 2$ (the latter condition corresponds to $|\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha|$ having real coefficients in the decomposition (4.25). Furthermore, from the proof of Theorem 4.2 we have that Spin(8) (or equivalently the group of Bogolyubov transformations $\mathcal{B}$) acts transitively on orthogonal pairs $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$. We conclude that the set of all states $|\psi\rangle$ corresponding to a given value of a is an orbit of $\mathcal{B}$. In particular, $a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ describes Gaussian states, while $a = 0$ is the orbit of $|a_8\rangle$. We conclude the proof by re-expressing the state vector $|\psi\rangle$, up to a phase, as a combination of orthogonal Gaussian states. Namely, setting $|\psi_G\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|\psi_1\rangle - i|\psi_2\rangle\right)$, we have

$$|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{1-p^2}|\psi_G\rangle + p\theta_+|\psi_G\rangle\,, \tag{8.24}$$

where $p = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\sqrt{1-a^2} - a\right)$. Gaussianity and orthogonality of $|\psi_G\rangle$, $\theta_+|\psi_G\rangle$ are immediately verified.

Proof of Lemma 4.33

The proof of (4.33) relies on Theorem 2 from [150] which, for our purposes, states that $F_{\mathrm{Gauss}}\,(\rho)$ can be described as a convex hull extension of a function defined on pure states:

$$F_{\mathrm{Gauss}}\,(\rho) = \sup_{\sum p_i|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| = \rho}\left(\sum_i p_i F_{\mathrm{Gauss}}\,(|\psi_i\rangle)\right)\,, \tag{8.25}$$

where

$$F_{\mathrm{Gauss}}\,(|\psi\rangle) = \max_{|\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \in \mathcal{G}} F\,(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|,\, |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|)\,.$$

Using the fact that for $|\psi\rangle \in \mathrm{Fock}_+\,(\mathbb{C}^4)$ we have the decomposition (4.32) we find that

$$F_{\mathrm{Gauss}}\,(|\psi\rangle) = \tilde{F}\,(C_+\,(|\psi\rangle))\,,$$

where $\tilde{F}(x) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-x^2}$ is a strictly concave decreasing function on the interval $[0, 1]$. Let $\rho = \sum_i p_i|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ be the optimal decomposition of ρ leading to (4.26). From [111] it follows the all pure states in this decomposition have the same value of the generalized concurrence, i.e. $C_+\,(|\psi_i\rangle) = C_+\,(\rho)$. Using this fact and (8.25) we have $F_{\mathrm{Gauss}}\,(\rho) \geq \tilde{F}\,(C_+\,(\rho))$. On the other hand, by the concavity of $\tilde{F}$ we have

$$\sum_i p_i F_{\mathrm{Gauss}}\,(|\psi_i\rangle) \leq \tilde{F}\left(\sum_i p_i C_+\,(|\psi_i\rangle)\right) = \tilde{F}\,(C_+\,(\rho))\,,$$

which concludes the proof of (4.33).

8.3. Proofs of results stated in Chapter 5

Proof of Proposition 5.1

Proof. Let us fix some orthonormal bases

$$\left\{|e_j^{(i)}\rangle\right\}_{j=1}^{j=N_j}\,,\; i=1,\ldots,L$$

of the spaces $\mathcal{H}_i$ composing the full tensor product $\mathcal{H}_d=\bigotimes_{i=1}^{L}\mathcal{H}_i$. Recall that in the considered case the operator A is given by

$$A=\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}-\mathbb{P}^{+}_{11'}\otimes\mathbb{P}^{+}_{22'}\otimes\ldots\otimes\mathbb{P}^{+}_{LL'}\,.$$

Note also that the operator A is LU invariant, i.e. $U\otimes UAU^{\dagger}\otimes U^{\dagger}=A$ for $U\in\mathrm{LU}$ and that $\mathcal{M}_d$ is an orbit of LU in $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_d\right)$. Due to the definition of the constant c

$$c=2\max_{|v\rangle\langle v|\in\mathcal{M}_d}\max_{|v_\perp\rangle\neq 0}\frac{\langle v|\langle v_\perp|A|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle}{\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle}=\max_{|v_\perp\rangle\neq 0}\frac{\langle\psi_0|\langle v_\perp|A|\psi_0\rangle|v_\perp\rangle}{\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle}\,,$$

where $|\psi_0\rangle=\otimes_{i=1}^{L}|e_1^{(i)}\rangle$and $|v_\perp\rangle$ is an arbitrary vector perpendicular to $|\psi_0\rangle$. Straightforward computation shows that[2]

$$A|\psi_0\rangle\left(|e_{j_1}^{(1)}\rangle\otimes|e_{j_2}^{(2)}\rangle\otimes\ldots\otimes|e_{j_L}^{(L)}\rangle\right)\perp|\psi_0\rangle\left(|e_{j_1'}^{(1)}\rangle\otimes|e_{j_2'}^{(2)}\rangle\otimes\ldots\otimes|e_{j_L'}^{(L)}\rangle\right)$$

whenever $(j_1,\ldots,j_L)\neq(j_1',\ldots,j_L')$. Consequently, we have

$$c=2\max_{(j_1,\ldots,j_L)}\langle\psi_0|\left(\langle e_{j_1}^{(1)}|\otimes\langle e_{j_2}^{(2)}|\otimes\ldots\otimes\langle e_{j_L}^{(L)}|\right)A|\psi_0\rangle\left(|e_{j_1}^{(1)}\rangle\otimes|e_{j_2}^{(2)}\rangle\otimes\ldots\otimes|e_{j_L}^{(L)}\rangle\right)\,.$$

The minimum $c=1-2^{1-L}$ is obtained for every array $(j_1,\ldots,j_L)$ that differs form $(1,\ldots,1)$ in every component. □

Proof of Proposition 5.3

Proof. The proof is essentially analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.3.2. Let us chose the following basis of $\mathcal{H}_f=\bigwedge^{L}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$,

$$|\psi_I\rangle=|\phi_{i_1}\rangle\wedge|\phi_{i_2}\rangle\wedge\ldots\wedge|\phi_{i_L}\rangle\,,\tag{8.26}$$

where $|\phi_i\rangle\in\mathbb{C}^d$, $I=\{i_1,i_2\ldots,i_L\}\subset\{1,\ldots,d\}$ and $|I|=L$. Recall that in the considered case the operator A is given by

$$A=\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}-\frac{2^L}{L+1}\mathbb{P}^{+}_{11'}\otimes\mathbb{P}^{+}_{22'}\otimes\ldots\otimes\mathbb{P}^{+}_{LL'}\left(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}}\otimes\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\right)\,.$$

Note also that the operator A is LU_f -invariant, i.e. $U\otimes UAU^{\dagger}\otimes U^{\dagger}=A$ for $U\in\mathrm{LU}_f$ and that $\mathcal{M}_f$ is an orbit of LU_f in $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}_f\right)$. Due to the definition of the constant c

$$c=2\max_{|v\rangle\langle v|\in\mathcal{M}_f}\max_{|v_\perp\rangle\neq 0}\frac{\langle v|\langle v_\perp|A|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle}{\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle}=\max_{|v_\perp\rangle\neq 0}\frac{\langle\psi_0|\langle v_\perp|A|\psi_0\rangle|v_\perp\rangle}{\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle}\,,$$

[2] See the proof of Theorem 5.2 for a deeper justification for this phenomenon.

where $|\psi_0\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \wedge |\phi_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |\phi_L\rangle$and $|v_\perp\rangle$ is an arbitrary vector perpendicular to $|\psi_0\rangle$. Straightforward computation shows that[3]

$$A|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_I\rangle \perp |\psi_0\rangle|\psi_{I'}\rangle\,,$$

for different L-element subsets subsets, $I, I' \subset \{1, \ldots d\}$. Consequently, we have

$$c = 2 \max_{I\subset\{1,\ldots d\}} \langle\psi_0|\langle\psi_I|A|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_I\rangle\,. \tag{8.27}$$

Computations analogous to those performed in the proof of Lemma 3.3 give the following formula,

$$\langle\psi_0|\langle\psi_I|A|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_I\rangle = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{L+1-k}\,, \tag{8.28}$$

where $k = |I \cap I_0|$. Consequently, the maximal value in 8.27 is obtained for the minimal possible k which equals (this follows from the definition of the wedge product) $\max\{0, 2L-d\}$. As a result we have

$$c = 1 - \frac{2}{L+1-\max\{0,2L-d\}}\,.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 5.4

Sketch of the proof. The proof is essentially analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.3.2 presented above. Let us chose the following basis of $\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$,

$$|\psi_I\rangle = \prod_{j\in J} a_j^\dagger|0\rangle\,, \tag{8.29}$$

where $J \subset \{1, \ldots, d\}$ are subsets of the set $\{1, \ldots, d\}$ that have even number of elements

$$|J| = 0, 2, \ldots, 2\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor\,.$$

Recall that the relevant operator $A : \text{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right) \to \text{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ is given by (5.25). Note also that the operator A is $\text{Spin}\,(2d)$ invariant, i.e. $U\otimes UAU^\dagger \otimes U^\dagger = A$ for $U \in \text{Spin}\,(2d)$ and $\mathcal{M}^+_g$ is an orbit of Spin (2d) in $\mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$. Therefore we have

$$c = 2 \max_{|v\rangle\langle v|\in\mathcal{M}^+_g} \max_{|v_\perp\rangle\neq 0} \frac{\langle v|\langle v_\perp|A|v\rangle|v_\perp\rangle}{\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle} = \max_{|v_\perp\rangle\neq 0} \frac{\langle 0|\langle v_\perp|A|0\rangle|v_\perp\rangle}{\langle v_\perp|v_\perp\rangle}\,,$$

where $|v_\perp\rangle$ is an arbitrary vector perpendicular to $|0\rangle$. A Straightforward computation shows that[4]

$$A|0\rangle|\psi_I\rangle \perp |0\rangle|\psi_I\rangle\,,$$

where $I \neq \emptyset$. Consequently we have

$$c = 2 \max_{\substack{I\subset\{1,\ldots,d\}\\ |I|\text{-even}}} \langle\psi_0|\langle\psi_I|A|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_I\rangle\,. \tag{8.30}$$

Equation (5.26) follows from the above expression when we implement the precise form of the operator A and compare numerically (for $d \leq 1000$) appropriate matrix elements (see the proof of Lemma 5.15 for details of the computations). □

[3] See the proof of Theorem 5.2 for a deeper justification for this phenomenon.

[4] See the proof of Theorem 5.2 for a deeper justification for this phenomenon.

Proof of Lemmas 5.8 and 5.11

Before we prove Lemmas 5.8 and 5.11 we first state and prove an auxiliary technical result that will be also used also in proof of Lemma 5.14.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$ be a matrix $\mathbb{C}^*$-algebra*[5] *and let $\mathcal{B} = \mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$ be the commutant of $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\mathcal{H}' \subset \mathcal{H}$ be a subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ and let $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ denotes the orthonormal projector onto $\mathcal{H}'$. Assume $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $\mathrm{Comm}'\,(\mathcal{C})$ denotes the commutant of a $\mathbb{C}^*$-algebra $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H}')$ in $\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H}')$ ($\mathrm{Comm}'\,(\mathcal{C}) \subset \mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H}')$). The following equality holds*

$$\mathrm{Comm}'\,(\mathcal{A}') = \mathcal{B}'\,, \tag{8.31}$$

where[6] *$\mathcal{A}' = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{A}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} \subset \mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H}')$ is a restriction of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{H}'$ and $\mathcal{B}' = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ is a restriction of $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{H}'$.*

Proof. Due to the fact that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} \in \mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{B}$ every element $X \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{A}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} = \mathcal{A}'$ has a form

$$X = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\tilde{X}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\tilde{X} = \tilde{X}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\,, \tag{8.32}$$

for $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{A}$. Moreover, for the same reason every$Y \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ belongs to the algebra $\mathcal{B}$. Consequently, we have $[X, Y] = 0$ and thus $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} \subset \mathrm{Comm}'\,(\mathcal{A}')$. Conversely, let $Y \in \mathrm{Comm}'\,(\mathcal{A}')$ using (8.32) and the fact that $Y\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}Y = Y$ we get the following chain of equalities

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = [Y, X] &= \left[Y, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\tilde{X}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\right]\,, \\ &= Y\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\tilde{X}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} - \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\tilde{X}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}Y\,, \\ &= \left[Y, \tilde{X}\right]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{8.33}$$

Equation (8.33) has to be satisfied by all $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{A}$. Consequently $Y \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ and therefore $\mathrm{Comm}'\,(\mathcal{A}') \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$. □

We are now ready to prove Lemma 5.8.

Proof of Lemmas 5.8 and 5.11. ***Bosonic case.*** We first focus on the case of bosons (Lemma 5.8). The proof of Lemma 5.11 is completely analogous and we will discuss it briefly latter. In the first step of the proof we show that $\mathbb{S}_b^k \in \mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathbb{C}\,[\Pi_b \otimes \Pi_b\,(\mathrm{LU}_b)])$, where operators $\mathbb{S}_b^k$ defined by Eq.5.90. In the second step we show that $\mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathbb{C}\,[\Pi_b \otimes \Pi_b\,(\mathrm{LU}_b)])$ is commutative and that $\mathbb{S}_b^k$ $(k = 0, \ldots, L)$ span $\mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathbb{C}\,[\Pi_b \otimes \Pi_b\,(\mathrm{LU}_b)])$.

Step 1. We start with proving that the commutant We first employ Lemma 8.1 to the situation in question. Let us first introduce some notation

$$\mathcal{H}_{tot} = \mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2L} = (\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_L) \otimes (\mathcal{H}_{1'} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{L'})\,, \tag{8.34}$$

$$\mathcal{H}' = \mathrm{Sym}^L\,(\mathcal{H}) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^L\,(\mathcal{H})\,,\ \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}\left[\left\{U^{\otimes 2L} |\, U \in \mathrm{SU}\,(\mathcal{H})\right\}\right]\,. \tag{8.35}$$

Due to the Schur-Weyl duality (c.f. Subsection 2.4.3) we have

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathrm{Comm}\,(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{C}\left[\{\rho\,(\sigma)\ |\, \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{2L}\}\right]\,,$$

[5] We use the term matrix $\mathbb{C}^*$-algebra in following sense: $\mathcal{A}$ is an matrix subalgebra of $\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H})$ which is closed under the operation of Hermitian conjugation, $A \to A^\dagger$.

[6] We use the notation $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{A}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ to denote a $\mathbb{C}^*$-algebra in $\mathrm{End}\,(\mathcal{H}')$ which is generated by operators of the form $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}X\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$, where $X \in \mathcal{A}$.

where $\rho : \mathfrak{S}_{2L} \to \mathrm{U}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2L}\right)$ is the standard representation of the permutation group of $2L$ element set[7] $\{1, \ldots, L, 1', \ldots, L'\}$ (for the definition of this representation see Subsection 2.4.3). We want to describe the commutant of $\mathbb{C}^*$-algebra

$$\mathcal{A}' = \mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_b \otimes \Pi_b\left(\mathrm{LU}_b\right)\right]\right) \tag{8.36}$$

which the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ restricted to $\mathcal{H}'$. Notice that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}} \in \mathcal{B}$ and consequently the assumptions of Lemma (8.1) are satisfied. Consequently we get

$$\mathrm{Comm}'\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{A}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\right) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\,.$$

The operators $\mathbb{S}^k_b$ by definition belong to $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$.

Step 2. The algebra $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ is now generated by operators

$$\rho\left(\tau_{ij}\right)|_{\mathcal{H}'} = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}} \rho\left(\tau_{ij}\right) \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1,\ldots,L\}} \circ \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}_{\{1',\ldots,L'\}}\,, \tag{8.37}$$

where $\tau_{ij} \in \mathfrak{S}_{2L}$ is a transposition between elements $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, L, 1', \ldots, L'\}$. Note that if $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ or $i, j \in \{1', \ldots, L'\}$ we have $\rho\left(\tau_{ij}\right)|_{\mathcal{H}'} = \mathbb{I}|_{\mathcal{H}'}$. Moreover, if $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ we have $\rho\left(\tau_{ij}\right)|_{\mathcal{H}'} = \rho\left(\tau_{11'}\right)|_{\mathcal{H}'}$. Consequently, algebra $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ is generated solely by operator $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\mathcal{B}\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ and thus must be commutative. We now show that powers of $\rho\left(\tau_{11'}\right)|_{\mathcal{H}'}$ can be expressed by $\mathbb{S}^k_b$. The explicit computation shows that the operator.

$$\tau = \sum_{\substack{i \in \{1,\ldots,L\} \\ j \in \{1',\ldots,L'\}}} \tau_{ij}$$

commutes with $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}$. We have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\tau\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} = L^2\, \rho\left(\tau_{11'}\right)|_{\mathcal{H}'}\,.$$

Moreover $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\tau^k\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'} = \left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\tau\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}'}\right)^k$ can be expressed via $\mathbb{S}^k_b$ $(k = 0, \ldots, L)$. This concludes the proof of the fact that operators $\mathbb{S}^k_b$ generate $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_b \otimes \Pi_b\left(\mathrm{LU}_b\right)\right]\right)$.

Fermionic case. Proof of the fact that $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_f \otimes \Pi_f\left(\mathrm{LU}_f\right)\right]\right)$ is commutative and that operators $\mathbb{S}^k_f$ $(k = 0, \ldots, L)$ span $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_f \otimes \Pi_f\left(\mathrm{LU}_f\right)\right]\right)$ is completely analogous. One can repeat all the steps of the proof given above. □

Proof of Lemma 5.9

Proof. We will show that inequalities (5.94) and (5.61) are equivalent in the considered setting. We fix the orthonormal basis $\{|e_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^N$of a single particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \approx \mathbb{C}^N$. As a highest weight state $|\psi_0\rangle$ of $\mathrm{LU_f}$ we take

$$|\psi_0\rangle = |e_1^{\otimes L}\rangle\,. \tag{8.38}$$

As normalized weight vectors we take (see Subsection 2.4.2 for details) the generalized Dicke states [151], $|\psi_\lambda\rangle = |\psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle$. Generalized Dicke states $|\psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle$ (and therefore the corresponding weights λ) are labeled by integer-valued sequences $\vec{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_N)$ of length N, which satisfy $n_1 + \ldots + n_L = L$. The explicit expression reads

$$|\psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{L!}{n_1! \cdot \ldots \cdot n_N!}}\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}\left(|e_1^{\otimes n_1}\rangle|e_2^{\otimes n_2}\rangle \ldots |e_N^{\otimes n_L}\rangle\right), \tag{8.39}$$

[7] We have employed the convention of labeling of elements of the $2L$ element set in agreement with the notation from Eq.8.34

where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes L} \to \mathcal{H}^{\otimes L}$ is the orthonormal projector onto $\mathrm{Sym}^L(\mathcal{H}) \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes L}$.

In what follows we apply (5.104) for the weight vectors specified above. Using Eq. (5.92) and making use of the introduced notation we get

$$\langle\psi_0|\langle\psi_\lambda|\mathbb{S}_b^k|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_\lambda\rangle = \langle\psi_0|\langle\psi_{\vec{n}}|\mathbb{S}_b^k|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|e_1^{\otimes L}\rangle\langle e_1^{\otimes L}|\right]_{(k)}\left[|\psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\vec{n}}|\right]_{(k)}\right), \tag{8.40}$$

where the trace in the right hand side is over the space $\mathrm{Sym}^k\mathcal{H}$. We now compute the above expression directly,

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|e_1^{\otimes L}\rangle\langle e_1^{\otimes L}|\right]_{(k)}\left[|\psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\vec{n}}|\right]_{(k)}\right) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[|e_1^{\otimes k}\rangle\langle e_1^{\otimes k}|\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(L-k)}\right]|\psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\vec{n}}|\right) = \langle\Psi_{\vec{n}}|\Psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle, \tag{8.41}$$

where vector $|\Psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle$ is given by

$$|\Psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1!\cdot\ldots\cdot n_N!\cdot L!}}\left[|e_1^{\otimes k}\rangle\langle e_1^{\otimes k}|\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(L-k)}\right]\sum_{\sigma\in S_L}\sigma\left(|e_1^{\otimes n_1}\rangle|e_2^{\otimes n_2}\rangle\ldots|e_N^{\otimes n_L}\rangle\right), \tag{8.42}$$

where S_L denotes the permutation group of L elements and permutations and $\sigma\in S_L$ act on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes L}$ in a natural manner. We notice that $\langle\Psi_{\vec{n}}|\Psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle = 0$ for $n_1 < k$ and therefore in what follows we assume $n_1 \geq k$. Keeping the track of all non-vanishing terms in (8.42) we get

$$|\Psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle = \frac{N(n_1,k)}{\sqrt{n_1!\cdot\ldots\cdot n_N!\cdot L!}}|e_1^{\otimes k}\rangle\otimes\sum_{\sigma\in S_{L-k}}\sigma\left(|e_1^{\otimes n_1-k}\rangle|e_2^{\otimes n_2}\rangle\ldots|e_N^{\otimes n_L}\rangle\right), \tag{8.43}$$

where $N(n_1,k) = \frac{n_1!}{(n_1-k)!}$ denotes the number of permutations in $\pi\in S_{n_!}$ preserving the set $\{1,\ldots,k\}\subset\{1,\ldots,n_1\}$. The inner product $\langle\Psi_{\vec{n}}|\Psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle$ can be now explicitly computed as in the right hand side of (8.43) we have a non-normalized Dicke state corresponding to $\vec{\tilde{n}} = (n_1-k, n_2, \ldots, n_N)$ and the final result is the following,

$$\langle\psi_0|\langle\psi_{\vec{n}}|\mathbb{S}_b^k|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle = \begin{cases}\frac{\binom{n_1}{k}}{\binom{L}{k}} & \text{if } k\leq n_1\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}. \tag{8.44}$$

Thanks to the Lemma 5.8, every operator $V\in\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_b\otimes\Pi_b(\mathrm{LU})\right]\right)\cap\mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}_b\otimes\mathcal{H}_b\right)$ can be written as

$$V = \sum_{k=0}^{L} a_k\mathbb{S}_b^k,$$

where $a_m\in\mathbb{R}$ are real parameters. By choosing all possible $|\psi_\lambda\rangle = |\psi_{\vec{n}}\rangle$ and applying (8.44) to (5.104) we obtain inequalities (5.94). □

Proof of Lemma 5.10

Proof. The proof of Lemma 5.10 is analogous to the proof of Lemma 5.7. The role of operators V^Y ($Y\subset\{1,\ldots,L\}$) is played by operators V_b^m ($m=0,\ldots,L$) wheres inequalities (5.77) are replaced by inequalities (5.94). The only difference lays in the fact that instead of transformation (5.85) we have the following linear mapping,

$$b_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\frac{\binom{n}{k}}{\binom{L}{k}}a_k, \tag{8.45}$$

where $n, k = 0, \ldots, L$. The inverse mapping of the above can be computed explicitly by noticing that (8.45) is a binomial transform of the sequence $\{\tilde{a}_k\}_{k=1}^{L}$, where $\tilde{a}_k = \frac{a_k}{\binom{L}{k}}$. Recall that the binomial transform [134] of a sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=0}^{L}$ is a sequence $\{y_n\}_{n=0}^{L}$, defined by

$$y_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} x_k \,. \tag{8.46}$$

The inverse formula of the above reads

$$x_k = \sum_{n=0}^{m} \binom{m}{k} (-1)^{n+k} \, y_n \,. \tag{8.47}$$

Therefore the inverse of (8.45) is given by

$$a_k = \sum_{n=0}^{m} \binom{m}{k} \binom{L}{k} (-1)^{n+k} \, b_n \,.$$

Application of the above formula to (5.93) in the analogous way as it was done with (5.86) in the proof of Lemma 5.10 finishes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 5.5

Proof. We show by a direct computation that

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} V^Y \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} = \frac{1}{\binom{L}{m}} V_b^m \,, \tag{8.48}$$

where $|Y| = m$, V^Y is defined in Eq.(5.82) and V_b^m is defined in Eq.(5.95).

First note that for all $X \subset \{1, \ldots, L\}$ with $|X| = k$ we have (via Eq.(5.90))

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \mathbb{S}^X \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} = \mathbb{S}_b^k \,.$$

Therefore we have

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} V^Y \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} \otimes \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} = -(-1)^m \sum_{k:k \geq m} N_L(k,m) \, (-1)^k \, \mathbb{S}_b^k \,, \tag{8.49}$$

where $N_L(k,m)$ denotes the number of k-element subsets of the L-element set which contains some fixed set consisting of m elements. Simple combinatorics shows that

$$N_L(k,m) = \binom{L-m}{k-m} = \frac{\binom{L}{k}\binom{k}{m}}{\binom{L}{m}} \,.$$

The above, when put together with (8.49), proves (5.10). □

Proof of Lemma 5.12

Proof. The proof is analogous to proofs of Theorems 5.6 and 5.9 and relies on Theorem 5.3. We will show the equivalence between inequalities (5.104) and (5.61) in this particular setting. Let

us fix the orthonormal basis $\{|e_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^N$ of a single particle Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \approx \mathbb{C}^N$. As a highest weight state $|\psi_0\rangle$ of $\mathrm{LU_f}$ we take

$$|\psi_0\rangle = |e_1\rangle \wedge |e_2\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |e_L\rangle \,. \tag{8.50}$$

As weight vectors we can take (see Subsection 2.4.2 for details) the standard Slater determinants that correspond to the choice of the orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{H}$.

$$|\psi_\lambda\rangle = |\psi_I\rangle = |e_{i_1}\rangle \wedge |e_{i_2}\rangle \wedge \ldots \wedge |e_{i_L}\rangle \,, \tag{8.51}$$

where $I = \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_L\}$ is the L-element subset of the set $\{1, \ldots, N\}$. Moreover we assume that indices $i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_L$ that appear in (8.50) are ordered increasingly. Therefore the weights λ, that correspond to weight vectors $|\psi_\lambda\rangle$ appearing in $\bigwedge^L \mathcal{H}$, can be identified with subsets L-element subsets $I \subset \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Let us denote $I_0 = \{1, \ldots, L\}$.

Our aim is to apply (5.104) for the weight vectors specified above. Using Eq. (5.102) and making use of the introduced notation we get

$$\langle\psi_0|\langle\psi_\lambda|\mathbb{S}_f^k|\psi_0\rangle|\psi_\lambda\rangle = \langle\psi_{I_0}|\langle\psi_I|\mathbb{S}_f^k|\psi_{I_0}\rangle|\psi_I\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left([|\psi_{I_0}\rangle\langle\psi_{I_0}|]_{(k)}\,[|\psi_I\rangle\langle\psi_I|]_{(k)}\right) \,, \tag{8.52}$$

where the trace in the right hand side is over the space $\bigwedge^k \mathcal{H}$. In order to compute the above expression explicitly we use the following identity [17], valid for all L-element sets I

$$[|\psi_I\rangle\langle\psi_I|]_{(k)} = \frac{1}{\binom{L}{k}} \sum_{\substack{J\,:\,J\subset I \\ |J|=k}} |\psi_J\rangle\langle\psi_J| \,, \tag{8.53}$$

where the summation is over all subset of the set I that have cardinality k. Plugging (8.53) to (8.52) we get

$$\langle\psi_{I_0}|\langle\psi_I|\mathbb{S}_f^k|\psi_{I_0}\rangle|\psi_I\rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{\binom{|I_0\cap I|}{k}}{\binom{L}{k}^2} & \text{if } k \leq |I_0 \cap I| \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \,. \tag{8.54}$$

Due to the Lemma 5.11 every operator $V \in \mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_f \otimes \Pi_f\left(\mathrm{LU}\right)\right]\right) \cap \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}_f \otimes \mathcal{H}_f\right)$ can be written as

$$V = \sum_{k=0}^{L} a_k \mathbb{S}_f^k \,,$$

where $a_m \in \mathbb{R}$ are real parameters. We note that as we go over all λ in (5.61) we essentially sample, by the virtue of (8.54), over all possible $|I_0 \cap I| = m = 0, \ldots, L$ (at this point we are using the assumption $2d \geq L$). Inequalities (5.104) follow from applying to the above expression inequalities (5.61) together with Eq.(8.54). □

Proof of Lemma 5.14

Sketch of the proof. Just like in the cases of bosons and fermions we will use Lemma 8.1. In [152] it was proven that operators

$$\tilde{\mathbb{C}}_k = \left(\sum_{\substack{X \subset \{1,\ldots,2d\} \\ |X|=k}} \prod_{i\in X} c_i \otimes c_i \right) \,, \; k = 0, 1, \ldots, 2d \,, \tag{8.55}$$

form a basis of the commutant of the spinor representation $\Pi_s \otimes \Pi_s$ of the group $\mathrm{Pin}\,(2d)$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. Moreover, form [152] it also follows that the commutant is commutative. We do not need to describe the group $\mathrm{Pin}\,(2d)$ in detail[8]. The representation Π_s of the group $\mathrm{Pin}\,(2d)$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ is generated by $\mathcal{B} = \Pi_s\left(\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)\right)$ and an arbitrary Majorana operator, say c_1. A simple observation shows that

$$\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_s^+ \otimes \Pi_s^+\left(\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)\right)\right] = \mathbb{P}_+ \mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_s \otimes \Pi_s\left(\mathrm{Pin}\,(2d)\right)\right] \mathbb{P}_+\,, \tag{8.56}$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}_+ \in \mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_s \otimes \Pi_s\left(\mathrm{Pin}\,(2d)\right)\right]\right)$$

is the orthonormal projector onto $\mathcal{H}^+_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}^+_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \subset \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$. We can now use Lemma 8.1 to infer that

$$\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_s^+ \otimes \Pi_s^+\left(\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)\right)\right]\right) = \mathbb{P}_+ \mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_s \otimes \Pi_s\left(\mathrm{Pin}\,(2d)\right)\right]\right) \mathbb{P}_+\,. \tag{8.57}$$

We can now use the formula

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{H}^+_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}^+_{\mathrm{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)} = \frac{1}{4}\left(\mathbb{I} + Q\right) \otimes \left(\mathbb{I} + Q\right)$$

and (8.55) to infer that $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_s^+ \otimes \Pi_s^+\left(\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)\right)\right]\right)$ is spanned by the operators

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_k = \left(\mathbb{I} + Q\right) \otimes \left(\mathbb{I} + Q\right) \tilde{\mathbb{C}}_k \left(\mathbb{I} + Q\right) \otimes \left(\mathbb{I} + Q\right)\,,\; k = 0, 1, \ldots, 2d\,.$$

Using the anticommutation relations satisfied by the Majorana fermion operations we obtain $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_k = 0$ for odd k and that for $k \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor$ $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_k = \widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_{2d-2k}$. We therefore obtain that

$$\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_s^+ \otimes \Pi_s^+\left(\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)\right)\right]\right)$$

is spanned by

$$\mathbb{C}_k = \mathbb{P}_+ \left(\sum_{\substack{X \subset \{1, \ldots, 2d\} \\ |X| = 2k}} \prod_{i \in X} c_i \otimes c_i \right) \mathbb{P}_+\,,\; k = 0, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor\,.$$

We conclude the proof by noting that operators $\mathbb{C}_k$ are formed by sums of expressions of the form

$$\prod_{i \in X} c_i \otimes c_i \pm \prod_{i \in \bar{X}} c_i \otimes c_i\,,$$

where $\bar{X}$ denotes the complement of the set X in the "global set" $\{1, \ldots, 2d\}$. From this we infer that operators $\mathbb{C}_k$, $k = 0, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor$, are linearly independent.

The commutativity of $\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_s^+ \otimes \Pi_s^+\left(\mathrm{Spin}\,(2d)\right)\right]\right)$ follows from the commutativity of

$$\mathrm{Comm}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\Pi_s \otimes \Pi_s\left(\mathrm{Pin}\,(2d)\right)\right]\right)$$

and Eq.(8.57). □

[8] The group $\mathrm{Pin}\,(2d)$ is defined as the universal covering group of $\mathrm{O}\,(2d)$.

Proof of Lemma 5.15

Proof. We are going to use Theorem 5.3 directly and thus we first recall the structure of weight vectors $|\psi_\lambda\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ of the representation Π^+_s. As discussed in Subsection 2.4.4 as a highest weight vector we can take the Fock vacuum $|0\rangle$. As weight vectors we can take Fock states with even number of excitations, i.e.

$$|\psi_\lambda\rangle = |\psi_I\rangle = \prod_{j\in J} a_j^\dagger |0\rangle\,, \tag{8.58}$$

where $J \subset \{1,\ldots,d\}$ is a subset of the set $\{1,\ldots,d\}$ with even number of indices $|J| = 0, 2, \ldots, 2\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor$. We assume that the product $\prod_{j\in J} a_j^\dagger$ in (8.58) is ordered in a non-increasing manner. Let us now compute $\langle 0|\langle\psi_J|\mathbb{C}_k|0\rangle|\psi_J\rangle$ for arbitrary even element set $J \subset \{1,\ldots,d\}$. Using the fact that $|0\rangle, |\psi_J\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 0|\langle\psi_J|\mathbb{C}_k|0\rangle|\psi_J\rangle &= \sum_{\substack{X\subset\{1,\ldots,2d\}\\ |X|=2k}} \langle 0|\langle\psi_J|\left(\prod_{j\in X} c_j\otimes c_j\right)|0\rangle|\psi_J\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\substack{X\subset\{1,\ldots,2d\}\\ |X|=2k}} \langle 0|\prod_{j\in X} c_i|0\rangle\langle\psi_j|\prod_{j\in X} c_i|\psi_J\rangle\,. \end{aligned}\tag{8.59}$$

Due to the definition of Majorana operators $\langle 0|\prod_{j\in X} c_j|0\rangle \neq 0$ if and only if subset X contains only pairs of indices associated to the same mode in the Fock space. In other words only nonzero contributions to the sum (8.59) come from X having the form

$$X = \{2i_1-1, 2i_1, 2i_2-1, 2i_2-1, \ldots, 2i_k-1, 2i_k\}\,,$$

where $\{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_k\} \subset \{1,\ldots,d\}$ as an arbitrary k-element subset of the set $\{1,\ldots,d\}$. Simple algebra gives the identity valid for $m = 1,\ldots d$,

$$ic_{2m-1}c_{2m} = -\left(\mathbb{I} - 2\hat{n}_m\right)\,, \tag{8.60}$$

where $\hat{n}_m$ is the operator of particle number in the m'th mode. Using (8.60) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 0|\langle\psi_J|\mathbb{C}_k|0\rangle|\psi_J\rangle &= \sum_{\substack{X\subset\{1,\ldots,d\}\\ |X|=k}} (-1)^k \langle 0|\prod_{j\in X}\left(\mathbb{I}-2\hat{n}_j\right)|0\rangle\langle\psi_J|\prod_{j\in X}\left(\mathbb{I}-2\hat{n}_j\right)|\psi_J\rangle \\ &= (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{X\subset\{1,\ldots,d\}\\ |X|=k}} \langle\psi_J|\prod_{j\in X}\left(\mathbb{I}-2\hat{n}_j\right)|\psi_J\rangle\,,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\langle 0|\hat{n}_j|0\rangle = 0$ for all $j = 1,\ldots d$. Binomial expansion of

$$\langle\psi_J|\prod_{j\in X}\left(\mathbb{I}-2\hat{n}_j\right)|\psi_J\rangle$$

and simple combinatorial manipulations give the following chain of equalities

$$\begin{aligned}\langle 0|\langle\psi_J|\mathbb{C}_k|0\rangle|\psi_J\rangle &= (-1)^k \sum_{\substack{X\subset\{1,\ldots,d\}\\|X|=k}} \sum_{m=0}^{k} (-2)^m \left(\sum_{\substack{Y\subset X\\|Y|=m}} \prod_{j\in Y} \langle\psi_J|\hat{n}_j|\psi_J\rangle \right) \\ &= (-1)^k \sum_{m=0}^{k} (-2)^m \binom{d-m}{k-m} \left(\sum_{\substack{Y\subset\{1,\ldots,d\}\\|Y|=m}} \prod_{j\in Y} \langle\psi_J|\hat{n}_j|\psi_J\rangle \right) \\ &= (-1)^k \sum_{m=0}^{\min\{k,|J|\}} (-2)^m \binom{d-m}{k-m}\binom{|J|}{m} \end{aligned} \tag{8.61}$$

Recalling that $|\psi_J\rangle$ labeled all weight vectors of Spin $(2d)$ in $\mathcal{H}^+_{\text{Fock}}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)$ and applying (8.61) to (5.61) for all subsets $J\subset\{1,\ldots,d\}$ having even number of elements we recover inequalities (5.111). □

8.4. Proofs of results stated in Chapter 6

Proof of Lemma 6.1

Proof. Due to the definition of the gradient ∇f and the structure of the tangent space $T_U\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ for $U\in\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ (see Eq.(6.8)) we have

$$g_{\text{HS}}\left(\nabla f|_U\,,\,XU\right) == \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} f_\Omega\left(\exp\left(tX\right)U\right)\,, \tag{8.62}$$

where $X=-X^\dagger$ and $XU\in T_USU(\mathcal{H})$ (the tangent space treated as a (real) subspace of $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{H})$). It follows that

$$\langle\nabla f|_U\,,\,XU\rangle = \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[X\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}+\mathbb{I}\otimes X\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-2)}+\ldots+\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}\otimes X,\,\rho'_1\otimes\ldots\otimes\rho'_k\right]V\right), \tag{8.63}$$

where $\rho'_i=U\rho_iU^\dagger$ and $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}$. We have the following chain of inequalities

$$|\langle\nabla f|_U\,,\,XU\rangle| \le 2\left|\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho'_1\otimes\ldots\otimes\rho'_k\,V\,\left[X\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}+\mathbb{I}\otimes X\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-2)}+\ldots+\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}\otimes X\right]\right)\right|. \tag{8.64}$$

$$\le 2\cdot\left(\left|\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho'_1\otimes\ldots\otimes\rho'_k\,V\,X\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}\right)\right|+\ldots+\left|\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho'_1\otimes\ldots\otimes\rho'_k\,V\,\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}\otimes X\right)\right|\right). \tag{8.65}$$

Every term on the right-hand side of (8.65) is bounded above by $\|X\|_{\text{HS}}=\sqrt{-\mathrm{tr}\left(X^2\right)}$. Let us consider $\left|\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho'_1\otimes\ldots\otimes\rho'_k\,V\,X\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}\right)\right|$ as the proof for the remaining terms is analogous. The following inequalities hold.

$$\left|\mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\rho'_1\otimes\ldots\otimes\rho'_k\right]\,V\,X\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}\right)\right| \le \left\|V\,X\otimes\mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}\right\|\,, \tag{8.66}$$

$$\le \|V\|\,\|X\|\,, \tag{8.67}$$

$$\le \|X\|_{\text{HS}}\,. \tag{8.68}$$

In (8.66) we used the fact that states $\rho_i^{'}$ are normalized so the modulus of expectation value of some operator cannot exceed its operator norm. In (8.67) we used the inequality $\|AB\| \leq \|A\| \, \|B\|$ and the spectral decomposition of $X \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\otimes(k-1)}$. In (8.68) we have used the assumption $\|V\| \leq 1$ and the inequality $\|X\| \leq \|X\|_{\mathrm{HS}}$ which is valid for all anti-Hermitian X (and follows from their spectral decomposition). Inserting (8.68) to (8.64) we get

$$|\langle \nabla f|_U \, , \, XU \rangle| \leq 2 \cdot k \, \|X\|_{\mathrm{HS}} \, .$$

Inserting to the above $XU = \nabla f|_U$ concludes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 6.2

Proof. The computation of $\mathbb{E}_\mu f_{\rho_1,\rho_2}$ follows easily from Weyl's "unitary trick" [78]. Due to the linearity of a trace we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu f_{\rho_1,\rho_2} = \mathrm{tr}\left(\int_{\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})} \left[U^{\otimes 2} \left\{ \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 \right\} \left(U^\dagger \right)^{\otimes 2} \right] d\mu \left(U \right) \, V \right) . \tag{8.69}$$

Due to the left-invariance of the Haar measure μ, for every $X \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \right)$ the operator $\hat{X} = \int_{SU(\mathcal{H})} dU \, \left(U^{\otimes 2} \, X \, \left(U^\dagger \right)^{\otimes 2} \right)$ is $\mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H} \right)$ invariant, i.e. $\left[U^{\otimes 2}, \hat{X} \right] = 0$. Consequently, due to Schur lemma (see Fact 2.12)

$$\hat{X} = a \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} + b \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}} \, , \tag{8.70}$$

where constants a, b can be computed easily: $a = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(X \, \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}})}{\dim(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}})}$ and $b = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(X \, \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}})}{\dim(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}})}$. Applying (8.70) to $X = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$, inserting the result to (8.69) and taking into account $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} = \frac{\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{S}}{2}$, $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{asym}} = \frac{\mathbb{I} \otimes \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{S}}{2}$ gives (6.25). □

Proof of Lemma 6.3.

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Lemma 6.2. For $f : \mathrm{SU}\left(\mathcal{H} \right) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by Eq (6.23) we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu f = \mathrm{tr}\left(\int_{\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})} \left[U^{\otimes k} \left\{ \rho \otimes \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \right)^{\otimes(k-1)} \right\} \left(U^\dagger \right)^{\otimes k} \right] d\mu \left(U \right) \, V \right) , \tag{8.71}$$

$$= \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\rho \otimes \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \right)^{\otimes(k-1)} \right] \int_{\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})} \left[U^{\otimes k} V \left(U^\dagger \right)^{\otimes k} \right] d\mu \left(U \right) \right) , \tag{8.72}$$

$$= \mathrm{tr}\left(\left[\rho \otimes \left(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \right)^{\otimes(k-1)} \right] \left[\left\{ (k-1) + \frac{\mathrm{tr}\left(A \right)}{\dim\left(\mathrm{Sym}^k \left(\mathcal{H} \right) \right)} \right\} \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym,k}} - (k-1) \, \mathbb{I}^{\otimes k} \right] \right) . \tag{8.73}$$

In Eq.(8.72) we used the invariance of the cyclicity of the trace and invariance of the Haar measure under the transformation $U \to U^{-1}$. In Eq.(8.73) we used the particular form of the operator V (see Eq.(6.38)). The equality (6.40) is a direct consequence of (8.73). □

Proof of Proposition 6.1

Proof. The values of the parameter c from Table (6.1) follows from the results of the Section 5.1. However, the values of the parameter $X = \frac{\dim(Im(A))}{\dim\left(\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H}) \right)}$ requires justification. The value of X for separable states follows directly from Eq.(3.23).

Let us now move to the case of bosonic product states and Slater determinants. One can identify $\mathcal{H}_b$ and $\mathcal{H}_f$ with the carrier spaces of irreducible representations of $SU(d)$ characterized by highest weights [9]

$$\lambda_b = (L, 0, \ldots, 0) \text{ and } \lambda_f = \left(\overbrace{1, \ldots, 1}^{L}, 0, \ldots, 0 \right) . \tag{8.74}$$

One can also represent λ by a Young diagram - a collection of boxes arranged in left-justified rows, with non-increasing lengths when looked from the top to the bottom. In Section 3.1 it was proven that the operator $A \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H})\right)$ defining families of separable bosonic states and Slater determinants is given by

$$A = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{2\lambda}, \tag{8.75}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{2\lambda}$ is the projector onto the unique irreducible representation of the type 2λ that appear in $\mathrm{Sym}^2(\mathcal{H})$ (treated as a carrier space of a representation of $SU(d)$). Therefore, the problem of computing X for bosonic separable states and Slater determinants reduces to computation of dimensions of representations of $SU(d)$ described by highest weights $2\lambda_b$ and $2\lambda_f$ respectively. We perform these computations explicitly using methods described in Subsection 2.4.3.

The value of X for the case of pure fermionic Gaussian states $\mathcal{M}_g^+ \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{Fock}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$ follows from the discussion from Section 3.1.5. It was proven there that in this case

$$A = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}} - \mathbb{P}^{+}\mathbb{P}_0\mathbb{P}^{+} ,$$

where:

- $\mathbb{P}_0$ is a projector onto eigenspace 0 of the operator $\Lambda \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Fock}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$, defined by $\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{2d} c_i \otimes c_i$,
- $\mathbb{P}^{+} = \frac{1}{4}(\mathbb{I} + Q) \otimes (\mathbb{I} + Q)$,
- $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym}}$ - projector onto $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}^+_{Fock}\left(\mathbb{C}^d\right)\right)$.

Straightforward computation shows that $\dim\left(\mathbb{P}^{+}\mathbb{P}_0\mathbb{P}^{+}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\dim\left(\mathrm{Im}\left(\mathbb{P}_0\right)\right) = \frac{1}{2}\binom{2d}{d}$. □

Proof of Proposition 6.2

Sketch of the proof. We show now that the values of the parameter $X = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(A)}{\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{P}^{k,\mathrm{sym}}\right)}$ are indeed given by expressions from Table 6.4. In the case of pure states $\mathcal{M}_n \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ follows directly from the form of the operator A which is relevant in this case (see Eq.(3.88)).

In the case of states $\mathcal{M}_d^3 \subset \mathcal{D}_1\left(\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d\right)$ that do not exhibit genuine multiparty entanglement situation is more involved and we limit ourselves only to giving the asymptotic of X in the limit $d \to \infty$. In what follows will use the notation from Subsection 3.3.1. In particular we will write $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3$, where $\mathcal{H}_i \approx \mathbb{C}^d$ and use the identification $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 6} \approx \left(\mathcal{H}_1^{\otimes 6}\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes 6}\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_3^{\otimes 6}\right)$. Let us first notice that in the considered scenario $k = 6$ and $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = d^3$ and consequently

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{P}^{k,\mathrm{sym}}\right) = \dim\left(\mathrm{Sym}^6(\mathcal{H})\right) = \binom{d^3+5}{6} = \frac{1}{6!}\left(d^3\right)^6 + O\left(\left(d^3\right)^5\right) = \frac{d^{18}}{6!} + O\left(d^{15}\right) , \tag{8.76}$$

[9] See Subsection 2.4.3 for the explanation of the notation used in (8.74).

On the other hand the operator A_{GME} is given by (see Eq.(3.81))

$$A_{\mathrm{GME}} = \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},6} \circ \left(A^{1:23} \otimes A^{2:13} \otimes A^{3:12}\right) \circ \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},6}\,,$$

where $A^{a:bc} \in \mathrm{Herm}\left(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}\right)$ is given by $A^{a:bc} = \mathbb{P}^{-}_{aa'} \circ \mathbb{P}^{-}_{\{bc\}\{b'c'\}}$. The operator $A^{1:23} \otimes A^{2:13} \otimes A^{3:12}$ is a projector onto some subspace $W \subset \mathcal{H}^{\otimes 6}$. Let us introduce the notation $\mathbb{P}_W = A^{1:23} \otimes A^{2:13} \otimes A^{3:12}$. We have

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(A_{\mathrm{GME}}\right) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{P}_W \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},6}\right) = \sum_{\alpha} \langle \alpha | \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},6} | \alpha \rangle\,, \tag{8.77}$$

where the index α runs over some orthonormal basis of W. Let us first focus on a single operator $A^{1:23}$ which projects on the subspace $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ of $\mathrm{Sym}^2\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$ spanned by normalized vectors of the form[10]

$$|\psi_{I_1;I_{23}}\rangle = \left(|i_1\rangle \wedge |j_1\rangle\right) \otimes \left(\left(|i_2\rangle \otimes |i_3\rangle\right) \wedge \left(|j_2\rangle \otimes |j_3\rangle\right)\right), \tag{8.78}$$

where

- $I_1 = \{i_1, j_1\}$, $I_{23} = \left(\{i_2, i_3\}, \{j_2, j_3\}\right)$
- $i_a, j_a \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, $i_1 > j_1$, $\{i_2, i_3\} \neq \{j_2, j_3\}$

In Eq. (8.78) we have used for convenience the identification $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2} \approx \left(\mathcal{H}_1^{\otimes 2}\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3\right)$. The vector $|\psi_{I_1;I_{23}}\rangle$ assumes implicitly that we have chosen the order of terms in I_1 as well as in I_{23}. In what follows when we write $|\psi_{I_1;I_{23}}\rangle$ we assume that for each $I_1$and I_{23} we chose exactly one ordering.

We can now turn to estimating the asymptotic behavior of $\mathrm{tr}\left(A_{\mathrm{GME}}\right)$. The basis of $W \subset \left(\mathcal{H}_1^{\otimes 6}\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes 6}\right) \otimes \left(\mathcal{H}_3^{\otimes 6}\right)$ can be now be chosen to consist of vectors of the form

$$|\alpha\rangle = |\psi_{I_1^{(1)};I_{23}^{(1)}}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{I_2^{(2)};I_{13}^{(2)}}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{I_3^{(3)};I_{12}^{(3)}}\rangle\,,$$

where vectors $|\psi_{I_1^{(1)};I_{23}^{(1)}}\rangle$, $|\psi_{I_2^{(2)};I_{13}^{(2)}}\rangle$ and $|\psi_{I_3^{(3)};I_{12}^{(2)}}\rangle$ are constructed analogously as above. The leading contribution to the sum in (8.77) comes from vectors $|\alpha\rangle$ such that each collection of indices

$$i_a^{(1)}, j_a^{(1)}, i_a^{(2)}, j_a^{(2)}, i_a^{(3)}, j_a^{(3)}\,, a = 1, 2, 3\,,$$

consists of six different numbers. The number of vectors $|\alpha\rangle$ satisfying such condition scales like $\mathcal{N} \approx \frac{d^{18}}{64}$. Moreover, direct computation shows that for $|\alpha\rangle$ of this form we have

$$\langle \alpha | \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},6} | \alpha \rangle = \frac{1}{6!} 8\,.$$

Consequently we get

$$\sum_{\alpha} \langle \alpha | \mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{sym},6} | \alpha \rangle \approx \mathcal{N} \frac{8}{6!} = \frac{d^{18}}{8 \cdot 6!}\,. \tag{8.79}$$

Combining (8.79) and (8.76) we get the desired result $\frac{\mathrm{tr}(A_{GME})}{\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathbb{P}^{k,\mathrm{sym}}\right)} = \frac{1}{8} + O\left(\frac{1}{d}\right)$. □

[10] By $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d}$ we denote the standard basis of $\mathbb{C}^d$.

Bibliography

[1] E. Schrödinger, The Present Status of Quantum Mechanics, Die Naturwissenschaften 23 1–26 (1935).

[2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?, Phys. Rev. 47 777 (1935).

[3] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, Quantum entanglement, Rev. Mod. Phys. 81 865–942 (2009).

[4] M. B. Plenio, S. Virmani, An introduction to entanglement measures, Quantum Info. Comput. 7 1–51 (2007).

[5] O. Gühne, G. Tóth, Entanglement detection, Phys. Rep. 474 1–75 (2009).

[6] R. F. Werner, Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model, Phys. Rev. A 40 4277–4281 (1989).

[7] L. Masanes, Useful entanglement can be extracted from all nonseparable states, J. Math. Phys. 49 022102 (2008).

[8] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, W. K. Wootters, Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 1895 (1993).

[9] C. H. Bennett, S. J. Wiesner, Communication via one-and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 2881 (1992).

[10] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, et al., Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing, in: Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Vol. 175, New York, 1984.

[11] A. K. Ekert, Quantum cryptography based on Bell's theorem, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 661 (1991).

[12] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, L. Maccone, Advances in quantum metrology, Nat. Phot. 5 222–229 (2011).

[13] J. Esteve, C. Gross, A. Weller, S. Giovanazzi, M. Oberthaler, Squeezing and entanglement in a Bose–Einstein condensate, Nature 455 1216–1219 (2008).

[14] F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, U. Marzolino, Entanglement and squeezing with identical particles: ultracold atom quantum metrology, J. Phys. B 44 091001 (2011).

[15] F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, U. Marzolino, Bipartite entanglement in systems of identical particles: the partial transposition criterion, Ann. Phys. 327 1304–1319 (2012).

[16] N. Killoran, M. Cramer, M. Plenio, Extracting Entanglement from Identical Particles, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112 150501 (2014).

[17] A. L. Fetter, J. D. Walecka, Quantum theory of many-particle systems, Courier Dover Publications, 2003.

[18] K. Wodkiewicz, J. Eberly, Coherent states, squeezed fluctuations, and the SU(2) and SU(1,1) groups in quantum-optics applications, JOSA B 2 458–466 (1985).

[19] R. R. Puri, Mathematical methods of quantum optics, Vol. 79, Springer, 2001.

[20] J. Schliemann, J. I. Cirac, M. Kuś, M. Lewenstein, D. Loss, Quantum correlations in two-fermion systems, Phys. Rev. A 64 022303 (2001).

[21] K. Eckert, J. Schliemann, D. Bruss, M. Lewenstein, Quantum correlations in systems of indistinguishable particles, Ann. Phys. 299 88–127 (2002).

[22] F. de Melo, P. Ćwikliński, B. M. Terhal, The power of noisy fermionic quantum computation, N. J. Phys. 15 013015 (2013).
[23] S. Bravyi, Lagrangian representation for fermionic linear optics, Quantum Info. Comput. 5 216–238 (2005).
[24] S. Bravyi, Universal quantum computation with the $\nu = 5/2$ fractional quantum Hall state, Phys. Rev. A 73 042313 (2006).
[25] J. Dereziński, M. Napiórkowski, J. P. Solovej, On the minimization of Hamiltonians over pure Gaussian states, in: Complex Quantum Systems. Analysis of Large Coulomb Systems, 2011, pp. 151-162.
[26] A. Perelomov, Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications, Springer, 1986.
[27] H. Barnum, E. Knill, G. Ortiz, R. Somma, L. Viola, A subsystem-independent generalization of entanglement, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 107902 (2004).
[28] A. Klyachko, Dynamical symmetry approach to entanglement, NATO Security through Science Series D: Information and Communication Security 7 25 (2007).
[29] B. M. Terhal, P. Horodecki, Schmidt number for density matrices, Phys. Rev. A 61 040301 (2000).
[30] A. Sawicki, M. Kuś, Geometry of the local equivalence of states, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44 495301 (2011).
[31] T. Maciążek, M. Oszmaniec, A. Sawicki, How many invariant polynomials are needed to decide local unitary equivalence of qubit states?, J. Math. Phys. 54 092201 (2013).
[32] M. Grassl, M. Rötteler, T. Beth, Computing local invariants of quantum-bit systems, Phys. Rev. A 58 1833 (1998).
[33] P. Vrana, Local unitary invariants for multipartite quantum systems, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44 115302 (2011).
[34] P. Vrana, On the algebra of local unitary invariants of pure and mixed quantum states, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44 225304 (2011).
[35] W. Dür, G. Vidal, J. I. Cirac, Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways, Phys. Rev. A 62 062314 (2000).
[36] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. De Moor, H. Verschelde, Four qubits can be entangled in nine different ways, Phys. Rev. A 65 052112 (2002).
[37] A. Sawicki, M. Walter, M. Kuś, When is a pure state of three qubits determined by its single-particle reduced density matrices?, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 46 055304 (2013).
[38] A. Sawicki, M. Oszmaniec, M. Kuś, Critical sets of the total variance can detect all stochastic local operations and classical communication classes of multiparticle entanglement, Phys. Rev. A 86 040304 (2012).
[39] A. Sawicki, M. Oszmaniec, M. Kuś, Convexity of momentum map, Morse index, and quantum entanglement, Rev. Math. Phys. 26 1450004 (2014).
[40] R. Sanyal, F. Sottile, B. Sturmfels, Orbitopes, Mathematika 57 275–314 (2011).
[41] R. R. Holmes, T.-Y. Tam, Distance to the convex hull of an orbit under the action of a compact Lie group, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A 66 331–357 (1999).
[42] L. Biliotti, A. Ghigi, P. Heinzner, Coadjoint orbitopes, arXiv preprint arXiv:1110.6039.
[43] J. Grabowski, A. Ibort, M. Kuś, G. Marmo, Convex bodies of states and maps, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 46 425301 (2013).
[44] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, S. Wehner, Bell nonlocality, Rev. Mod. Phys. 86 419 (2014).
[45] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, V. Vedral, The classical-quantum boundary for correlations: discord and related measures, Rev. Mod. Phys. 84 1655 (2012).
[46] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox, Physics 1 195–200 (1964).
[47] L. Henderson, V. Vedral, Classical, quantum and total correlations, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 34 6899 (2001).

[48] H. Ollivier, W. H. Zurek, Quantum discord: a measure of the quantumness of correlations, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88 017901 (2001).
[49] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, Quantum computation and quantum information, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
[50] M. Oszmaniec, P. Suwara, A. Sawicki, Geometry and topology of CC and CQ states, J. Math. Phys. 55 062204 (2014).
[51] E. Wigner, Group Theory: And its Application to the Quantum Mechanics of Atomic Spectra, Academic Press, 1959.
[52] E. P. Wigner, Normal form of antiunitary operators, J. Math. Phys. 1 409–413 (1960).
[53] L. Gurvits, Classical deterministic complexity of Edmonds' Problem and quantum entanglement, in: Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, ACM, 2003, pp. 10–19.
[54] S. Gharibian, Strong NP-hardness of the Quantum Separability Problem, Quantum Info. Comput. 10 343–360 (2010).
[55] S. Aaronson, Quantum computing since Democritus, Cambridge University Press, 2013.
[56] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions, Phys. Lett. A 223 1–8 (1996).
[57] B. M. Terhal, Bell inequalities and the separability criterion, Phys. Lett. A 271 319–326 (2000).
[58] M. Reed, B. Simon, Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics: Vol: 1 : Functional Analysis, Academic Press, 1972.
[59] A. Peres, Separability criterion for density matrices, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 1413 (1996).
[60] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, Reduction criterion of separability and limits for a class of distillation protocols, Phys. Rev. A 59 4206 (1999).
[61] B. M. Terhal, Detecting quantum entanglement, Theor. Comput. Sci. 287 313–335 (2002).
[62] A. Uhlmann, Roofs and convexity, Entropy 12 1799–1832 (2010).
[63] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations, Phys. Rev. A 53 2046 (1996).
[64] W. K. Wootters, Entanglement of formation and concurrence., Quantum Info. Comput. 1 27–44 (2001).
[65] F. Mintert, M. Kuś, A. Buchleitner, Concurrence of mixed bipartite quantum states in arbitrary dimensions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 167902 (2004).
[66] F. Mintert, A. R. Carvalho, M. Kuś, A. Buchleitner, Measures and dynamics of entangled states, Phys. Rep. 415 207–259 (2005).
[67] L. Aolita, F. Mintert, Measuring multipartite concurrence with a single factorizable observable, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97 050501 (2006).
[68] F. Mintert, A. Buchleitner, Observable entanglement measure for mixed quantum states, Phys. Rev. A 98 140505 (2007).
[69] M. Kotowski, M. Kotowski, M. Kuś, Universal nonlinear entanglement witnesses, Phys. Rev. A 81 062318 (2010).
[70] A. C. Doherty, P. A. Parrilo, F. M. Spedalieri, Complete family of separability criteria, Phys. Rev. A 69 022308 (2004).
[71] M. Navascués, M. Owari, M. B. Plenio, Power of symmetric extensions for entanglement detection, Phys. Rev. A 80 052306 (2009).
[72] M. Navascués, M. Owari, M. B. Plenio, Complete Criterion for Separability Detection, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 160404 (2009).
[73] F. G. Brandão, M. Christandl, J. Yard, A quasipolynomial-time algorithm for the quantum separability problem, in: Proceedings of the forty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, ACM, 2011, pp. 343–352.
[74] F. G. Brandão, M. Christandl, Detection of multiparticle entanglement: Quantifying the

search for symmetric extensions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 160502 (2012).
[75] D. Chruściński, A. Jamiołkowski, Geometric Phases in Classical and Quantum Mechanics, Springer, 2004.
[76] I. Bengtsson, K. Życzkowski, Geometry of Quantum States, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
[77] M. Nakahara, Geometry, Topology and Physics, Second Edition, IOP Publishing, 2003.
[78] B. C. Hall, Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Representations: An Elementary Introduction, Springer, 2000.
[79] A. O. Barut, R. Rąaczka, Theory of Group Representations and Applications, World Scientific, 1986.
[80] B. C. Hall, Quantum Theory for Mathematicians, Springer, 2013.
[81] S. Kobayashi, K. Nomizu, Foundations of Differential Geometry, Vol.1, Willey & Sons, 1991.
[82] W. Fulton, J. Harris, Representation Theory: A First Course, Springer, 1991.
[83] A. Arvanitoyeorgs, An introduction to Lie groups and the geometry of homogeneous spaces, Vol. 22, American Mathematical Society, 2003.
[84] H. Elvang, P. Cvitanović, A. D. Kennedy, Diagrammatic Young projection operators for U(n), J. Math. Phys. 46 043501 (2005).
[85] W. Fulton, Young tableaux: with applications to representation theory and geometry, Vol. 35, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
[86] R. Goodman, N. R. Wallach, Representations and invariants of the classical groups, no. 68, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
[87] J. R. Klauder, B.-S. Skagerstam, Coherent States: Applications in Physics and Mathematical Physics, World Scientific, 1985.
[88] R. Delbourgo, J. R. Fox, Maximum weight vectors possess minimal uncertainty, J. Phys. 10 L233–5 (1977).
[89] M. Kuś, I. Bengtsson, Classical quantum states, Phys. Rev. A 80 022319 (2009).
[90] J. Schliemann, D. Loss, A. H. MacDonald, Double-occupancy errors, adiabaticity, and entanglement of spin qubits in quantum dots, Phys. Rev. B 63 085311 (2001).
[91] S. Bravyi, R. Koenig, Classical simulation of dissipative fermionic linear optics, Quantum Info. Comput. 12 925–943 (2012).
[92] A. Sanpera, D. Bruß, M. Lewenstein, Schmidt-number witnesses and bound entanglement, Phys. Rev. A 63 050301 (2001).
[93] M. Oszmaniec, M. Kuś, On detection of quasiclassical states, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 45 244034 (2012).
[94] M. Oszmaniec, M. Kuś, Universal framework for entanglement detection, Phys. Rev. A 88 052328 (2013).
[95] M. O. et. al., Multilinear criteria for detection of generalised entanglement, In preparation.
[96] W. Lichtenstein, A system of quadrics describing the orbit of the highest weight vector, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. 84 605–608 (1982).
[97] R. Augusiak, M. Lewenstein, Towards measurable bounds on entanglement measures, Quantum Inf. Process. 8 493–521 (2009).
[98] W. Helwig, W. Cui, J. I. Latorre, A. Riera, H.-K. Lo, Absolute maximal entanglement and quantum secret sharing, Phys. Rev. A 86 052335 (2012).
[99] C. Chevalley, The Algebraic Theory of Spinors and Clifford Algebras: Collected Works, Vol. 2, Springer, 1997.
[100] L. Manivel, et al., On spinor varieties and their secants, SIGMA 5 078 (2009).
[101] M. Bañuls, J. I. Cirac, M. M. Wolf, Entanglement in fermionic systems, Phys. Rev. A 76 022311 (2007).
[102] J. Eisert, C. Simon, M. B. Plenio, On the quantification of entanglement in

infinite-dimensional quantum systems, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 35 3911 (2002).
[103] G. Gour, Family of concurrence monotones and its applications, Phys. Rev. A 71 012318 (2005).
[104] P. Migdał, J. Rodríguez-Laguna, M. Oszmaniec, M. Lewenstein, Multiphoton states related via linear optics, Phys. Rev. A 89 062329 (2014).
[105] F. Verstraete, V. Murg, J. I. Cirac, Matrix product states, projected entangled pair states, and variational renormalization group methods for quantum spin systems, Adv. Phys. 57 143–224 (2008).
[106] F. Levi, F. Mintert, A quantitative theory of coherent delocalization, N. J. Phys. 16 033007 (2014).
[107] A. Sawicki, V. V. Tsanov, A link between quantum entanglement, secant varieties and sphericity, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 46 265301 (2013).
[108] A. W. Harrow, The church of the symmetric subspace, arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.6595.
[109] P. Badziag, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, R. Augusiak, Separability in terms of a single entanglement witness, Phys. Rev. A 88 010301 (2013).
[110] W. K. Wootters, Entanglement of formation of an arbitrary state of two qubits, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 2245 (1998).
[111] A. Uhlmann, Fidelity and concurrence of conjugated states, Phys. Rev. A 62 032307 (2000).
[112] O. Giraud, P. Braun, D. Braun, Classicality of spin states, Phys. Rev. A 78 042112 (2008).
[113] M. Oszmaniec, J. Gutt, M. Kuś, Classical simulation of fermionic linear optics augmented with noisy ancillas, Phys. Rev. A 90 020302 (2014).
[114] M. Oszmaniec, M. Kuś, Fraction of isospectral states exhibiting quantum correlations, Phys. Rev. A 90 010302 (2014).
[115] J. F. Adams, Lectures on exceptional Lie groups, University of Chicago Press, 1996.
[116] D. Montgomery, H. Samelson, Transformation groups of spheres, Annals of Mathematics 454–470 (1943).
[117] T. Friedrich, Weak Spin(9)-Structures on 16-dimensional Riemannian Manifolds, arXiv preprint: math/9912112.
[118] C. Olmos, A geometric proof of the Berger holonomy theorem, Ann. of Math. 579–588 (2005).
[119] A. Y. Kitaev, A. Shen, M. N. Vyalyi, Classical and quantum computation, no. 47, American Mathematical Society, 2002.
[120] R. P. Feynman, Simulating physics with computers, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 21 467–488 (1982).
[121] D. Gottesman, The Heisenberg representation of quantum computers, in: Proceedings of the XXII International Colloquium on Group Theoretical Methods in Physics, Cambridge, MA, International Press, 1999, pp. 32–43.
[122] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne, H. J. Briegel, Measurement-based quantum computation on cluster states, Phys. Rev. A 68 022312 (2003).
[123] B. M. Terhal, D. P. DiVincenzo, Classical simulation of noninteracting-fermion quantum circuits, Phys. Rev. A 65 032325 (2002).
[124] P. Kok, W. J. Munro, K. Nemoto, T. C. Ralph, J. P. Dowling, G. Milburn, Linear optical quantum computing with photonic qubits, Rev. Mod. Phys. 79 135 (2007).
[125] S. Aaronson, A. Arkhipov, The computational complexity of linear optics, in: Proceedings of the 43rd annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, ACM, 2011, pp. 333–342.
[126] A. Kitaev, Unpaired Majorana fermions in quantum wires, Physics-Uspekhi 44 131 (2001).
[127] A. Kitaev, Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond, Ann. Phys. 321 2–111 (2006).
[128] J. Alicea, New directions in the pursuit of Majorana fermions in solid state systems, Rep. Prog. Phys. 75 076501 (2012).

[129] L. Mazza, M. Rizzi, M. D. Lukin, J. I. Cirac, Robustness of quantum memories based on Majorana zero modes, Phys. Rev. B 88 205142 (2013).
[130] S. Bravyi, A. Kitaev, Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas, Phys. Rev. A 71 022316 (2005).
[131] V. Veitch, S. H. Mousavian, D. Gottesman, J. Emerson, The resource theory of stabilizer quantum computation, N. J. Phys. 16 013009 (2014).
[132] C. A. Fuchs, J. Van De Graaf, Cryptographic distinguishability measures for quantum-mechanical states, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 45 1216–1227 (1999).
[133] R. T. Rockafellar, Convex analysis, no. 28, Princeton University Press, 1997.
[134] D. E. Knuth, R. Graham, O. Patashnik, Concrete Mathematics: A Foundation for Computer Science, Addison–Wesley, 1989.
[135] P. Horodecki, From limits of quantum operations to multicopy entanglement witnesses and state-spectrum estimation, Phys. Rev. A 68 052101 (2003).
[136] W. Hall, Multipartite reduction criteria for separability, Phys. Rev. A 72 022311 (2005).
[137] K. Życzkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera, M. Lewenstein, Volume of the set of separable states, Phys. Rev. A 58 883 (1998).
[138] K. Życzkowski, Volume of the set of separable states II, Phys. Rev. A 60 3496 (1999).
[139] S. J. Szarek, E. Werner, K. Życzkowski, How often is a random quantum state k-entangled?, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44 045303 (2011).
[140] G. Aubrun, S. J. Szarek, D. Ye, Phase transitions for random states and a semicircle law for the partial transpose, Phys. Rev. A 85 030302 (2012).
[141] P. Hayden, D. W. Leung, A. Winter, Aspects of generic entanglement, Comm. Math. Phys. 265 95–117 (2006).
[142] M. B. Hastings, Superadditivity of communication capacity using entangled inputs, Nat. Phys. 5 255–257 (2009).
[143] M. Ledoux, The concentration of measure phenomenon, Vol. 89, American Mathematical Society, 2005.
[144] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet, O. Zeitouni, An introduction to random matrices, no. 118, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
[145] L. Gurvits, H. Barnum, Better bound on the exponent of the radius of the multipartite separable ball, Phys. Rev. A 72 032322 (2005).
[146] R. Hildebrand, Entangled states close to the maximally mixed state, Phys. Rev. A 75 062330 (2007).
[147] K. Życzkowski, H. Sommers, Hilbert–Schmidt volume of the set of mixed quantum states, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 36 10115 (2003).
[148] H. Sommers, K. Zyczkowski, Bures volume of the set of mixed quantum states, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 36 10083 (2003).
[149] M. Kac, Probability and related topics in physical sciences, Vol. 1, American Mathematical Society, 1957.
[150] A. Streltsov, H. Kampermann, D. Bruß, Linking a distance measure of entanglement to its convex roof, N. J. Phys. 12 123004 (2010).
[151] P. Parashar, S. Rana, Reducible correlations in Dicke states, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 42 462003 (2009).
[152] H. Wenzl, On centralizer algebras for spin representations, Comm. Math. Phys. 314 243–263 (2012).